

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. LI

JULY, 1953

NO. 1087

Responsibilities of Universities

DR. KONRAD ADENAUER

Address delivered by the German Federal Chancellor at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., on the occasion of his being awarded the Degree of Honorary Doctor of Laws, April 7, 1953

I AM deeply moved to receive the diploma and insignia of the honorary doctorate of Georgetown University. In the course of my life, a fair number of distinctions, some of them also academic, have been conferred upon me. It is, however, a matter of particular gratification to me to be thus honored by the oldest Catholic university in the United States, an institution which plays a leading part in the academic and spiritual life of this great country.

My relations with this university do not date just from today. I have long known your merits and your reputation. A few weeks ago I suggested to the President of the Federal Republic of Germany the bestowal upon the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, one of the men who add luster to

your university, of the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany.

My closest collaborator in the German Foreign Office, Secretary of State Professor Hallstein, was a faculty member of your university for a year and has often told me about it. The head of the legal division of my Foreign Office, Professor Mosler, has also been a guest professor here. I know that Georgetown was one of the first American universities which decided to resume exchange relations with German professors and to intensify cooperation with German scholarly life after the bitter years of interruption caused by the Nazi regime and the war. I am also grateful to you that you declared your readiness to offer to some of our young attache-

chés, after their graduation from our diplomats' courses, the opportunity of continuing their studies at your university, in particular at your world-renowned School of Foreign Service. Thus you will understand that I am happy to be able to express to you in person my very sincere gratitude on this solemn occasion.

In recent days I have repeatedly had the opportunity of referring to the decisive struggle which is going on between the constructive forces of the free world and the destructive powers of atheist totalitarianism. In this decisive struggle, the military defense, economic consolidation and social progress of the free nations play a great role, to be sure. But let there be no illusions about the fact that military and economic strength alone will not be able to offer resistance to the ever-spreading totalitarian ideology.

FALSE IDEOLOGIES

We are in the midst of a decisive spiritual struggle in which universities have a great task to perform. Some educational institutions bear an ample share of responsibility for the false ideologies menacing the peace and freedom of the world through totalitarian systems of different kinds. Many of these destructive theories were taught from academic chairs long before politicians got hold of them, popularized them and made them into totalitarian party ideolo-

gies. The reason I am so outspoken about this is because I am anxious to stress the responsibility which rests on institutions of higher education throughout the world, and particularly in both our countries. It is their responsibility to do everything by way of scientific research and teaching to disprove false theories endangering the future of the world, and to discover and develop the principles best suited to guarantee to human society, as organized in the family, the state and the comity of nations, that healthy and peaceful progress which humanity has a right to expect.

Georgetown University consciously bases its research and teaching upon *Christian humanism*. This seems to me of particular significance in the sphere of international relations. The obligations inherent in the idea of good faith, the recognition of an order based on law and binding upon everyone, the rejection of state omnipotence and narrow state egotism, the affirmation of the solidarity of all men and nations and its concomitant responsibilities, the defense of the *bonum commune* of an international order, the rejection of pernicious race theories, the respect for the dignity and God-given liberty of the individual—all these are ideas which have, to a considerable extent, been formed and developed by Christian thought.

It is for this reason that an institution like Georgetown University is called upon to furnish decisive

contribution to the clarification of the principles on which the comity of nations rests and to draw upon the rich treasures of Christian thought in order to solve, by irreproachable scholarly methods, the difficult problems which modern life poses for us.

Sound ideas are not the only contribution the world expects from a university like yours. Over and above this, it has the task of developing young people into genuine personalities, individuals conscious of their personal responsibilities and able to withstand the temptations of collectivism.

The different totalitarian systems could never have gained control over millions of human beings unless certain tendencies in modern civilization had prepared the ground for subjugation of the masses. In large measure, modern man is no longer conscious of his autonomy or his value as a human being, no longer works out his own philosophy of life but often for reasons of convenience accepts the ready-made norms offered to him by some collective body. This collective, anti-individualistic spirit, in diametrical opposition to the very essence of a university, has even invaded the institutions of higher education, notwithstanding the fact that it is one of their chief

tasks to educate the younger generation to independent thinking and creative work.

In this sphere, too, a Christian university today has an imperative task to perform. It is its particular function to educate its students so that they may become mature and independent individuals who base their lives on the value of religion, which is the best safeguard against the infiltration of atheist totalitarianism.

STUDENT COMMUNITY LIFE

That the forming of personalities can go hand in hand with education in community responsibilities is proved by the highly developed student community life in American universities and colleges, a fact which is recognized and much admired in my country. Certain German institutions of higher education, too, are now setting up student community houses for which the generosity of your country has provided a number of highly appreciated grants, thanks especially to the invaluable assistance from the former U. S. High Commissioner in Germany, Mr. McCloy.

I very much hope that we may be able to welcome an ever-growing number of American students in these newly established German students' houses. The extension of the out-

standing Fulbright Program to the Federal Republic, for which I once more want to thank the American Government most sincerely, will offer, year by year, to an ever-increasing number of American students and professors the opportunity of attending German universities and colleges. They will receive a most cordial welcome from us, just as the many German students who have been privileged since the end of the war to go to America at the invitation of the Department of State, and of colleges and universities, churches and other community groups, met with a hospitality here such as, you may be sure, will never be forgotten by the German people.

I should be very glad if among the first Fulbright scholars to come to Germany this fall there were also students of Georgetown University. But

in order to make quite sure that I shall personally be able to welcome in Germany at least one of you, my young friends, at the beginning of the coming term, I want to ask your President to select a student of Georgetown University to come to Germany as the guest of the Federal Republic and spend one year at one of our universities or colleges as the holder of a full fellowship.

May I conclude my remarks by congratulating all of you, my young friends, on the privilege that is yours in being able to study at a university which so pre-eminently does justice to the great national and international responsibilities of a modern university by its world-renowned achievements in research and teaching, by its Christian principles and by the importance it attaches to the development of character.



Color in the Theatre

Most colored actors, however, are fully aware that casting for ability can be supported as a principle, or even adopted as a policy, more easily than it can be put in practice when assembling a cast for a run-of-the-mill play script. They also know that an actor's physical appearance is included in his ability to make a character plausible. It would be folly to cast a hunchback as Romeo or an actress with a harelip as Juliet. To cast a dark-skinned actor as a banker, or as Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, when most people in the audience have a fixation that all Negroes are Pullman porters or day laborers, just wouldn't make sense. It is an unpleasant fact that in the American theatre, as presently organized, color is a handicap.—*Theophilus Lewis in the* **INTERRACIAL REVIEW**, *New York, N. Y., April, 1953.*

Palestine and the Holy Places

Recent letters and reports from the Holy Land, edited and collated by a correspondent formerly resident in Jerusalem

*Reprinted from THE SWORD**

HAD it not been for the recent illness and abdication of King Talal of Jordan, there is at least a possibility that Israel might by now have found herself alone in defying the recommendations of the United Nations as regards the status of Jerusalem. For according to a report in the usually well-informed *Rayon d'Egypte* earlier this year, the then King of Jordan was said to have declared himself in favor of some form of international control for the Holy City in conformity with the ideas, not only of the United Nations, but also of the Holy See. Meanwhile, a later reminder as to international interest in this matter of Jerusalem comes from the United States, whose Government, according to the *Catholic Herald* for August 2, has advised Israel against transferring its Foreign Office thither from Tel Aviv.

Today, despite the past efforts of the United Nations, there is still no true peace between Jew and Arab, but merely an uneasy armistice whose terms leave the new State of Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan suspiciously facing each other

across a frontier line that actually cuts straight through the Holy City, leaving the Old City in Arab and the New in Jewish hands. The Holy Places, the most sacred shrines of Christendom, are thus under the divided control of two mutually hostile and non-Christian states, whose rulers regard what they have so hardily won and so firmly hold in Jerusalem itself as of such vital importance that for three long years both have defied the efforts of the United Nations to establish an international régime.

The Holy See, too, has persistently called for international control of Jerusalem and the sacred shrines, and it is in fact one of the essential conditions enumerated by the Pope himself in the encyclical *Redemptoris Nostri* of Good Friday, 1949, as necessary for the establishment of a true and righteous peace "in a region so dear to the heart of every Christian." How much some form of international control is called for today appears from a letter recently received from a member of a famous religious establishment, who declares:

* 128 Sloane St., London, S.W. 1, September-October, 1952.

In view of the precarious position of the Catholic Church in particular and of Christian Churches in general in present-day Israel, Jerusalem must be internationalized in the interests of Christian rights and of the freedom of the Holy Places. This internationalization must be that originally envisaged, to include Jerusalem and its environs with Bethlehem, Ain-Karim and the Mount of Olives and Bethany, as also Nazareth and the shrines of Galilee, in all about 72 miles, and not merely a "token" internationalized area, let alone the absurd internationalization of the Old City, which comprises only about one-quarter of Jerusalem, leaving the greater part of the so-called New City, which is, or was, 65 per cent Arab-owned in Jewish hands.

Internationalization of only the Old City would also be grossly unfair to Jordan, within whose territories all the Christian communities always have been treated with sympathy and consideration.

THE RIGHTS OF PILGRIMS

Closely allied to this question of international control of the Holy Places is the encyclical's demand for their safeguarding and for the rights of pilgrims to free access and "tranquil sojourn." Such a demand is necessary because it is obvious that the safety of the shrines would at once be endangered were the present armistice to give way to a resumption of hostilities. Hence the need for them to be rendered "extra-territorial" as between the two potentially hostile states within whose boundaries they

at present lie. Similarly as regards "free access," which is even now much impeded by the Iron Curtain frontier arrangements, graphically described by a Catholic resident in these words:

Pilgrims landing in Israel are very often unaware that it is possible to cross over into the Old City (where the Holy Sepulchre and principal shrines are) only after formalities which require from three days to a week or more; conversely: just as many arrive in the Old City not knowing that their proposed visit to the shrines of Galilee depends upon Israeli permission to "cross the lines" after negotiations that may take from 72 hours to several weeks. And having in due course reached the desired goal they cannot recross "the frontier" dividing Jerusalem! How many cases are there of disappointment and heartbreak to find at the end of a long and perhaps lifetime planned journey, that one cannot see all of the Holy Land, but must be content with gazing over a city wall at some longed-for sanctuary.

There is also a strong feeling amongst many local Catholics that, unlike the sympathetic attitude of Jordan, the outlook of Israel remains basically anti-Christian, and especially anti-Catholic, irrespective of declarations to the contrary by the Israeli Government.

Here a moment's thought may well explain how hard it must be for the tough young men and women, who have sometimes braved all to reach their Jewish haven from persecutions in Europe, to make allowances for the

spiritual beliefs and susceptibilities of others, since they themselves are often entirely materialistic in outlook and must often live an arduous life of toil in a communal settlement without the blessings of a family home or religion as we know it.

But whatever their past tragedy, and whatever the rights or wrongs of these people's claims to the bulk of Palestine, Christians cannot and must not permit them to violate or endanger the holiest places of the Christian Faith, either intentionally or in the course of a renewed struggle with the Arabs. Hence the additional necessity for effective and international control of the Christian shrines, which would, of course, give similar protection and rights of free access to certain other places in Jerusalem that are specially sacred to the Muslim and Jewish faiths.

FREEDOM FOR INSTITUTIONS

This question of the Holy Places is not, however, the only matter that should concern Catholics in regard to the Holy Land. The Pope's encyclical also reminds us that the Church has countless convents, monasteries and other institutions throughout Palestine, in addition to the parish churches originally serving some 40,000 Catholic Arabs. For all of these there must be liberty "so that they can continue, as is their right, their healthful and provident activity in the future." At the present time such

activity has suffered grievously from the period of hostilities, when various religious buildings were badly damaged and, in at least one case, totally destroyed by Israeli explosives, whilst others were profaned and looted. Furthermore, the exodus of Arab refugees, amongst whom were many Catholics, not only disrupted parochial life and increased the Church's charitable commitments beyond all measure, but also deprived her of financial contributions from well-to-do local residents who are themselves numbered among the refugees.

A striking example of present difficulties under this heading appears as a *cri de détresse* in the Cairo Greek-Catholic monthly *Le Lien* for November last year, in which His Beatitude Maximus IV, the Greek Catholic (Melkite) Patriarch, estimates a minimum of 23,200 pounds as necessary for "running repairs" to his people's ecclesiastical buildings, churches and schools in the Jerusalem-Ramallah-Bethlehem area alone, and where, as compared to Catholics of our Latin (Roman) rite, the Melkite community is in a minority.

Meanwhile, compensation for actual war damage remains a matter for negotiation between the various ecclesiastical authorities and the Government of Israel. To these negotiations the Catholic press in this country has alluded from time to time, whilst some time back comment on the present state of the Dormition

Abbey and its delayed evacuation by Zionist forces was dealt with in an explanatory letter from the Israeli Legation to the *Catholic Herald*.

Finance is not, however, the Church's only problem. Actual ecclesiastical organization is also much hampered by the Iron Curtain frontier arrangements already described as so distressing to pilgrims. Thus the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Franciscan Custody have jurisdiction, property and commitments in both Jordan and Israel. The Patriarch and the Custos have permanent passes to travel to and fro, but the normal transfer of ordinary religious and other routine day-to-day problems of administration are rendered almost impossible.

Similarly in Northern Palestine, where the majority of Catholics belong to the Melkite rite, contact between those dwelling in the Haifa (Galilee) Archdiocese in Israel and the rest of the far-flung Patriarchate in Egypt and the Arab lands is by no means easy. The Archbishop himself (Mgr. Hakim) has, however, a permanent pass, and since his return after the Armistice he has been treated with consideration and even distinction by the Israeli authorities, amongst whom he has said there is a growing realization of the importance of spiritual and moral values.

Catholic hopes that this may indeed be so were greatly encouraged by news that the Israeli Foreign Minis-

ter, Mr. Sharett, had requested an opportunity to pay a visit of courtesy and homage to His Holiness the Pope, when he was in Rome for conversations with the Italian Government at the end of last March. Whilst it would seem that no political discussions took place with the Vatican, Catholics will nevertheless have welcomed reports in the Tel Aviv press as quoted in the *Times* that "Israel identified herself unhesitatingly with Mr. Sharett when he emphasized the wish of the State and of all Jews to maintain good relations with the great Roman Catholic Church." For, irrespective of the rival claims of Arab and Zionist, the Church desires to dwell at peace and in real and sincere amity with all those of good-will who inhabit the Holy Land, provided they admit her legitimate rights, regardless of whether they be Muslims or Jews.

In *Redemptoris Nostri* the Holy Father called for the "conservation of all the rights that Catholics have acquired through many centuries in Palestine, rights which they have strenuously and many times defended, rights which the Sovereign Pontiffs have always solemnly and firmly reaffirmed."

THE FRANCISCANS

With the acquisition of these rights the glorious history of the Franciscan Order is closely related. Indeed, it may be said that, as the Crusaders left

the Holy Land, so the intrepid Friars came in, and so today do they bear the title of Custodians of the Holy Places. Their "Custody" has as its seal the five-fold cross which was originally the coat-of-arms of the old Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem founded by the Crusaders. For something of their history, for a graphic account of the Holy Places, and for fine photographs of historic buildings and sacred ceremonies all over Palestine, we can thank two members of the Order and a friend of theirs today.¹

Meanwhile, it is important to realize that the various rights and privileges granted to the Church by Muslim rulers, and particularly by the Sultans of Turkey, were in the main recognized by the British Mandatory authorities when the Turks were defeated and expelled in 1917. Similarly, the regulations laid down by the Sublime Porte as governing the claims of the various Christian communities in relation to each other over their respective "spheres of interest" in the Holy Places were regarded as binding and continued to be enforced by the British.

This policy is still wisely followed by Jordan, in whose territory are the two major shrines of the Holy Sepulchre and Bethlehem, while amongst much that was distressing in Zionist

conduct during the period of hostilities it is pleasing to record that at Nazareth Israeli behavior was declared to have been irreproachable, and so continues.

THE PATRIARCHS

Mention of the Franciscan "Custody" calls for a reminder that the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem, which has ecclesiastical jurisdiction over both Palestine and Jordan, was revived in the 1870's and is of course closely integrated with the Custody. The present Patriarch, His Grace, Archbishop Gori, was formerly the Custos, and the honors and welcome accorded to him by the late King Abdullah, when he paid his first visit as Patriarch to Amman, showed that Jordan at any rate wished as far as possible to show the maximum goodwill and respect to the Church.

An equally gratifying and cordial reception was extended by King Talal to the Greek-Catholic (Melkite) Patriarch, His Beatitude Maximus IV, who paid a state visit to Amman last year after taking possession of his Patriarchal See of Jerusalem. For the Holy City, as a Patriarchal See, gives its title "of Jerusalem" not only to the revived Latin Patriarchate, but also to the historic and highly important threefold Eastern-rite Patriarch-

¹ *The Catholic Shrines of the Holy Land*. By the Very Rev. Paschal Kinsel, O.F.M., and the Rev. Leonard Henry, O.F.M., with photographs by Alfred Wragg. (Cassell; 21s.)

ate of the Greek-Catholic or Melkite Church, which is equally a part of the Universal Church. Indeed no Catholic reference to Palestine should ignore this at first sight somewhat complex situation, since the Melkite Church is not only involved in the Holy Land on an over-all Catholic basis, but is also very intimately connected with many of the Arab countries and with Egypt.

With the understandable exception of Jordan, these latter have all along accepted the principle of international control for Jerusalem, and have generally welcomed the Papal encyclical, whilst Syria has gone even further and only last January suggested at the United Nations meeting in Paris that the Holy City should be internationally controlled by a Governor to be nominated by the Pope.

Whether feasible or not, this latter suggestion might perhaps neutralize one important objection against internationalization, usually raised by intelligent Jordanians—namely, that international control would give Soviet Russia a chance to meddle in the Old City in the same way that Israel has given her a footing in the New City by handing over ecclesiastical property of the former "White" Russian Church to the present Moscow Patriarchate.

Apart from this interest in such an obviously political matter, all the Arab League countries are even more concerned over the problems of the

Arab refugees. They are deeply appreciative of the generosity of the Holy See and of the assistance given to these unfortunate people by the Pontifical Mission for Palestine. Such assistance depends in turn on the contributions of the faithful, to the need for which the encyclical drew particular attention, although, alas, with only meagre results among Catholics in the United Kingdom. Though still urgently required, such charity is not of course a final solution, whilst the whole question of resettlement and rehabilitation has been complicated by the understandable though somewhat impracticable insistence of the Arab countries that the refugees should be enabled to return to their homes.

Since the Melkite Church counts some 20,000 dispossessed persons amongst its Palestinian adherents, we can expect to find it working to this end, and such is indeed the case. The Patriarch himself publicly and most courteously declared in Jerusalem last year that, as regards the refugees, "We would prefer one ounce of justice to one ton of almsgiving."

Those responsible for the original eviction of the Arabs are of course morally guilty of a crime that is only equalled by the apathy of the whole civilized world in permitting the situation to continue. Since, however, at this later stage it is more than ever unlikely that hundreds of thousands of its original Arab inhabitants could

be re-absorbed into the increasingly congested Israel, it seems that the United Nations is now making some effort to deal more realistically with the situation and that, with the agreement of the Arab States, the financial and resettlement schemes propounded at the Paris meeting in January, 1952 may have some beneficial effect.

As regards the local activities of the Melkite Patriarchate, some token success has attended the persistent efforts of Archbishop Hakim in Northern Palestine, where it appears that the authorities have permitted the Haifa Archdiocese to welcome back various Catholic orphans and others for whom the Archbishop has been able to arrange the necessary provision.

Such very briefly is an over-all picture of the Holy Land as it appears today from a Catholic viewpoint. To this it should perhaps be added that Jordan is said to be anxious for diplomatic relations with the Vatican, whither the former King Talal went prior to his illness to be received by the Holy Father. At present that latter's representative in Palestine as a whole is an Apostolic Delegate, Msgr. Testa, whose official position does not carry diplomatic status and in Jerusalem at any rate could on occasion be somewhat overshadowed by the great prestige attaching to the Custody and the Latin Patriarchate. This did in fact tend to occur in the days of the British Mandate, and made it

possible for the then Delegate, the late Msgr. Arthur Hughes, to concentrate almost entirely on work in Egypt, which was at that time included in the Delegation, but now has full diplomatic relations direct with the Holy See. The Franciscan Custody of the Holy Places has also some ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Egyptian delta, where one of the major Vicariates, which includes Alexandria and part of Cairo, still depends upon the Custos, just as the Latin Patriarchate in its turn has ecclesiastical jurisdiction over another "foreign" territory—namely the British-owned island of Cyprus.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

And so in conclusion it remains only to draw attention again to the Holy Father's wish, expressed towards the end of the encyclical already quoted, that the faithful should be informed as to affairs in Palestine. Without such information we can do nothing to help, but with an intelligent interest we can at least support the efforts of the Holy See and of those of good-will by our prayers and perhaps also by our almsgiving to the refugees. We can also on suitable occasions draw the attention of our legislators and the press to the dangers of the present situation, as also to the absolute necessity of safeguarding the whole Christian heritage and our Catholic rights in the Holy Land. Palestine may indeed

be out of sight, as it is far away, but surely, as the scene of Our Blessed Lord's sojourn upon earth, its holy places should never be out of mind amongst those who call themselves Catholics.



The Indestructible Family

In spite of the gloomy statistics about divorces, broken homes, absentee parenthood, mothers working in factories, children left without supervision, by and large the American family and home may still be regarded as a going concern. This perhaps is no particular merit of ours, but must rather be attributed to the fact that nature does not fail in what is essential and necessary.

Marriage and the family have a deep and ineradicable foundation in human nature. Throughout human history the home has maintained its essential structure and form. Not only has it survived; it has actually improved in some respects. Indeed, the traditional home is in every way the best thing for mankind and no amount of tinkering will be able to destroy this beneficent institution, which is as conducive to individual welfare as it is indispensable to the preservation of the social order and civilization.—THE WANDERER, *St. Paul, Minn., March 26, 1953.*

Family Subsidies

Civilization in the United States becomes every day more industrialized and citified.

There is no doubt about it—it is more expensive to raise children in the city than on the farm. Country people, it is true, have their own problems and expenses in raising children. But in the country, housing of the children is relatively easier, the cost of food is less and children at a comparatively early age can help support themselves and their families by doing farm work.

Legislators and the public should face the facts. We must change our laws and other institutions to conform with changes in our way of life. "Let every family take care of its own children" was perhaps a sound principle in a rural society. It is not so certain that such a principle is still valid in twentieth-century America.

The practice of family subsidies is no new and untried experiment. Canada has paid such subsidies for a long time and they have proved so popular that no Canadian political party would think of trying to abolish them.—THE WITNESS, *Dubuque, Iowa, March 26, 1953.*

From Moscow to Rome

CAROL HYDE

*Reprinted from the CATHOLIC HERALD**

I WAS a Communist when I had my first child. At that time very few of my women friends, all of whom were Communists, had children. Later on, having babies came into vogue in the Party, but not then; there were other and more important things to do. We were considered by some to be a little eccentric, embarking on such a project at such a time. They argued that it was undesirable from the Communist point of view to bring children into such a rotten capitalist world.

Two months after my daughter was born I went back to work, and she was placed in a nursery, because a Communist woman mustn't be a slave to her kitchen, or her children, for that matter. During the first four years of her life she went to four different nurseries. No sooner had she settled in one, than for one reason or another she had to readjust her little mind to another set of faces and other surroundings. It freed me to go to work and thus be economically independent, which is the aim of every good Communist woman.

At the time this seemed perfectly

Mrs. Hyde is the wife of J. Douglas Hyde, former managing editor of the London DAILY WORKER, and himself a convert to the Church.

normal. And also I was pleased that my daughter would go to anyone (she was used to seeing so many strange faces), and was not shy like some babies.

Within a few months of the birth of our second child, Catholic influences had begun to creep in. I had been getting more and more disillusioned as a Communist, and now for the first time a whole new world had come my way. It appeared to me as a sane, natural and wholly desirable one. And when we finally took the plunge and started instructions in the Faith, there were very soon new friends anxious to help us and welcome us into their homes.

How different these homes were from the ones we had known. Homes with happy children. Not just an only child. Previously we had very rarely

* The Catholic Herald, 67 Fleet St., London, E.C. 4, England, March 13, 1953.

known anyone with more than one, and the fact that we were having a second one ourselves had seemed positively anti-social to our comrades. But in these homes to which we were now introduced there was a healthy attitude to the family and each new child was longed for and welcomed on arrival. I saw serene Catholic mothers ruling over their families in a way that was new to me. How happy they seemed and what a lovely thing family life appeared as compared with what I had known and experienced before.

Here were women who actually believed that the father should be head of the family. I found that very difficult to understand at first, but later I saw how necessary it was for a stable family life.

But what particularly struck me was the importance of the mother in the home. Father the "head," mother the "heart" of the home. This was a different sort of equality and to my mind a better and more sensible one.

Many good Catholic families, I found, tried to base their life on that of the Holy Family, and what a difference the act of trying made. Coming into it from outside I was conscious of what a wonderful place the home could be. Those who have always been Catholics don't realize how different their idea of the home and family is from that of the modern pagan.

I thought what my "home" life had

been until now, dashing to the nursery with my little girl day after day. I had wanted economic security, but what security had there been for her as a baby? Ours had been a thoroughly selfish point of view.

Nor, for that matter, had it given me real happiness either. I was no serene mother. Life was one long scramble for her and me. She was in the nursery having her breakfast by eight in the morning. I travelled up to London and got to the office by nine o'clock, leaving again at five p.m. My daughter had already had her last meal when I collected her at six, as the nursery was closing, so I rushed her home and put her straight to bed.

That was the extent of my knowledge of her as a little person for five days out of seven and the week-end was taken up with Communist Party activity. She was obviously being moulded much more by the nursery than by me. In fact, she had her roots nowhere.

It was only later that I realized how little I knew my own child, and what both she and I had missed. As Communists we had had no sense of family. Home was a base for other activities, not the center of our lives.

WRONG OUTLOOK

There were two things which helped to convince me that I was wrong in my outlook on the family. First, reading about the idea of the

Catholic family (my contact with Catholics came later). Secondly, by the time our son was born, I was no longer at work, and so for the first time I really saw of how much, in my ignorance, I had deprived my daughter.

A young child needs every bit of security you can give it and she had had none. All this in the name of emancipation of women. There was no being rushed from place to place for our little boy. I hastened to try to repair any damage that might have been done to his sister, and when a few months later I became a Catholic I thanked God that there was still time to make amends to her for what she had missed.

I feel that in fairness to those who work in nurseries I must say that in my experience most of those I knew—there was one unfortunate exception—did a good job, although they couldn't provide a substitute for the mother and the home. Everything went like clockwork. It was all wonderfully clean and almost too hygienic. Some of the young nurses showed real affection for the children, though they all naturally had their favorites. But a vital something was missing.

There may be circumstances in which nurseries are a necessity, but in my opinion they should never be used from choice. Of course, as a Communist, I thought nurseries should be

used on principle, as a means of freeing my sex from the slavery of the home.

There is one thing, I feel, that is hampering family life, even amongst Catholics, and that is the shortage of houses.

I know a very good Catholic family who when I last saw them were living in two rooms, with two young children and a third on the way. The mother, although longing for the new addition, was at the same time terribly worried about it. "I don't like to think what the landlady will say when the third arrives on the scene," she told me. "It's bad enough with two young children in two rooms; she has hinted that if we have another, we shall have to find somewhere else. But there just doesn't seem to be places to be had for people like ourselves."

I feel that is a tragic situation, and I am afraid it is all too common these days.

If, as a Communist, I missed a lot in the way of ordinary human happiness which comes from motherhood, I missed a great deal more besides. It is a most thrilling thing to watch your children's understanding of God unfold as you teach them their prayers and their little religious duties. That is a joy that only those with the Faith can experience. It is when motherhood comes into its own. But it is something which we should never take for granted.

Fear and Faith in South Africa

HORTON DAVIES

*Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, Rhodes University,
Grahamstown, S.A.*

*Reprinted from PEOPLE & FREEDOM**

AN English poet has written a couplet which exactly describes our South African racial situation:

*Fear has come to live with us
In poisoned intimacy, like pus.*

The purpose of this article is to analyze the symptoms and causes of our chronic anxiety, and to assess the importance of faith in the present crepuscular situation. Faith is taken in its widest sense to include both the historic Christian churches and missionary societies and such extra-ecclesiastical factors as make for trust in a multi-racial society.

The visitor to the largest "City of Gold," Johannesburg, where white and black alike come in their hundreds of thousands to seek their fortunes, would be struck by the apparatus of fear. Perhaps he would not be unduly surprised by the posses of police so grimly silent at the fringes of seditious African conventions or at the sudden police raids into the shanty-towns dignified by the title of "locations." I think, however, that he would be amazed at the burglar-proof windows which are "standard-fitting"

for the most modest suburban homes, at the automatics kept conveniently handy in bedside cupboards or under pillows for the use of European men and women alike, or at their insistence on being accompanied when walking through native townships or dark European sidewalks at night. Even the most rabid dog-lover would, I fancy, be appalled at the fierce mien and military manners of the Johannesburg dogs, for the mastiffs and bull-dogs, the Rhodesian Ridgebacks and the Dobermann Pinschers are the bull-necked sergeants of the canine world. In this city they seem to breed and cherish only the Fascist protagonists of George Orwell's *Animal World*!

The situation is better in the country districts, but even here the farmers take no chances. Any rustle outside the farmhouse at night would result in a rifle-shot, for here they shoot first and then investigate. Is there another country in the world where the farming community petitions the Minister of Justice to build a jail at their own expense for Non-

* 32 Chepstow Villas, London, W. 11, England, August-October, 1952.

Europeans? (The term "Non-European" is significantly employed to deny personality to men of another race.) Indeed, absurdity goes even further, for the Minister of Justice presided in person at the opening of this institution for the preservation of cheap convict labor for farmers. The fact is that hundreds of thousands of Africans are imprisoned each year for such technical offenses as non-payment of poll taxes or for failure to carry a pass establishing their right to be employed in a particular locality. The inequality of Non-Europeans before the law is itself a measure of the fear of the whites that if they are not punished with the utmost severity, the Coloreds and Africans will not "keep their place." The recent repressive measures introduced or discussed by the Malan Government are merely another morbid symptom and proof that the body politic of South Africa is infected by the microbes of suspicion and fear.

CAUSES OF FEAR

The causes of racial fear and prejudice are manifold.

1. Despite its ironically inapposite title, the "Union" of South Africa is the prey of *fissiparous tendencies*. It is probably the most acutely divided country in the modern world. South Africa has two national anthems, two official languages (English and Afrikaans, excluding the four main Bantu languages), two capitals (Cape Town

legislative, Pretoria executive, excluding supplementary claims that are made for Johannesburg as the commercial and Bloemfontein as the juridical capital), and even schizophrenia is too simplified a diagnosis of the South African social situation, though both Afrikaners and English customarily act as if they were the only races that matter.

The situation is, in fact, much more complex. There are four racial divisions in the Union, each with several sub-divisions. The census authorities use the following labels: (a) Europeans: predominantly persons of Dutch and British stock, with others of French, German, Scandinavian and Jewish extraction; (b) Coloreds: persons of mixed blood, primarily Eurafricans, with a considerable number of Malayan origin; (c) Asiatics, including Indians and Chinese; and (d) Natives, that is, persons of African stock. In 1946 (when the last census for which there are complete returns was taken) the numbers of the four groups were: Europeans—2,335,460; Coloreds—905,090; Asiatics—282,539; Natives—7,735,809. The total population numbered 11,258,858.

The acute racial tension is caused by the fact that the European minority of approximately two-tenths dominates the African majority of approximately seven-tenths. The preliminary figures for the later census show that the situation is even more

menacing for the whites, as the Africans outnumber the Europeans four to one. The problem of race-relationships, already acute enough in the early nineteenth century, was rendered more so by the importation of Indians into Natal as sugar-laborers in the later nineteenth century and of Chinese for the gold mines in the early part of the present century.

Divisiveness is further accentuated by the differing outlooks of the controlling white groups, Afrikaner and British. Bernard Shaw's epigram still holds true, that the trouble with South Africans is that they will keep on fighting the Anglo-Boer War. Though neither group is conspicuously liberal in outlook, yet the Englishman is disposed to be less repressive to the Africans mainly because he can still regard England as home, whereas the Afrikaner cut the cultural ties with Europe when he left Holland (still an over-populated country) exactly three hundred years ago. The Englishman has another homeland, but the Afrikaner has not: so that a frontier rather than a colonial attitude dominates his thinking.

It would, however, be erroneous to make too much of this distinction because there are conspicuous liberal leaders amongst the Afrikaans-speaking whites, because the British who have been several generations in South Africa share the Afrikaner attitude, and, in any case, the Afrikaners outnumber the British element in the

white population. It will be clear already that a great variety of races, languages and cultures emphasizes the divisiveness that is such an outstanding characteristic of the social and political life of the Union. The vast numerical superiority of the Non-Europeans (coupled with their relative technical and cultural inferiority) over the Europeans motivates the fear that interprets might as right and pronounces reconciliation to be weakness.

2. The second major factor in our fears is *injustice* in the economic, political and social spheres of life, for injustice inevitably breeds the terror of vindication. Economically, the black man's ceiling is the white man's basement and the possibility of improved working conditions and remuneration is severely restricted by the official proscription of inter-racial trade unions. It is lamentable to record that few trade-union organizers showed a notable anxiety to break the color-bar. This also explains the weakness of Socialism in South Africa, preached by a white man's party, and, in turn, explains how readily the Africans may become either the pawns of the Communist Party, since this is the only party of the proletariat in South Africa, or join the belligerent African Nationalist Movement. The color-bar also prevents South Africa from utilizing her chief asset, skilled labor. This, in consequence, means that the African is malnourished (we

have the highest tuberculosis rate in the world), that the national income is strained to the utmost to provide educational and social services for the African, who could provide them for himself if his purchasing power were increased after training as a skilled worker. (The "poor whites" have no doubts as to his capacity!)

Politically, apart from the Bunga (a safety-valve for the Africans without any legislative authority), the Non-Europeans have negligible privileges. They have no direct representation in the House of Assembly or the Senate, nor have they ever held such privileges. At present they elect three Europeans to represent their interests in each House, but no members of their own race may offer themselves as candidates. The Government headed by Dr. Malan proposes to take away even these exiguous rights in the interest of segregation or *apartheid*. In their place, it is proposed to establish Colored and African Advisory Councils, without authority. Any government which refuses to recognize the rights of minorities ceases to be representative, but a government which steadily refuses to recognize the fundamental human rights of the vast majority in the interests of so-called "White civilization" is, in fact, its own wrecker.

The refusal to concede social equality stems from the same poisonous upas tree of fear. Since the determining factor in social life in South Africa

is skin pigmentation (or, strictly, the lack of it), no opportunity for miscegenation must be presented, for such disrespect for the purity of the white blood and the consequent mixture of the white race would spell the doom of white civilization. This fear of social egalitarianism is not, of course, wholly irrational, because it recognizes that past repression would clamor for vengeance when the Non-Europeans can outvote the Europeans. Furthermore, the present level of cultural and technical attainment by the Non-European races in South Africa (limited very considerably by lack of opportunities) as compared with European achievements accounts for the existence of "two races" in the sense in which Disraeli used the term of nineteenth-century Britain. Nonetheless, to postpone the social day of judgment is the only result of postponing the ending of repression. Our Christian reading of history is that men begin by breaking the laws of God and end by breaking themselves.

3. The third fear-producing factor may be described as a *split conscience*. The South African European lives on the same razor-edge as Gunnar Myrdal exposed so brilliantly in *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. Its lesson for South Africa may be paraphrased thus: the African problem is at bottom a problem in the heart of the white man. The whites are inheritors of a Judaeo-Christian tradi-

tion which recognizes that all men are made in the image of God, and of a Western political tradition of democracy which accepts that government must be "of the people, by the people, for the people." Yet they deny their birthright in practice. The solution must be either that white South Africans implement the imperatives of their heritage, or, by the adoption of an increasingly repressive and Fascist type of government, put a *herrenvolk* theory into ruthless practice and in ceasing to be humane relinquish their humanity and their Christianity. At present their dilemma is Hamlet's, "Thus conscience doth make cowards of us all, and the native hue of resolution is sicklied o'er with a pale cast of thought." It is to be feared that the disease must become even graver before more radical remedies will be sought.

SIGNS OF FAITH

The cynic might be disposed to say that all hope for the future springs from outside the Union of South Africa. There is considerable truth in this judgment. Undoubtedly, the pressure of world opinion, as evidenced in the resolutions of the United Nations or the International Missionary Council, strongly favors the African and holds his white overlords as culpable. Economically, South Africa is deeply dependent upon the good-will of the United States and the British Commonwealth and cannot be undisturbed

by the present drying-up of overseas capital for her industrial and commercial development. Furthermore, despite South Africa's desire to remain isolated in haughty hypocrisy (as it must seem to the world outside), she is gravely perturbed by the projected creation of a Federation of Central African States to her North, as she has been fearful of the granting of political enfranchisement to West Africa. These factors may drive her in a liberal direction, willy-nilly.

What organizations are working for racial cooperation within the Union? The Christian Churches, the Universities and the Institute of Race Relations are the most significant. The most courageous churches are Anglican and Roman Catholic, which admit members of all races to their services of worship. Three of the outstanding custodians of the rights of Africans are communicants of the Anglican Church of the Province: Mrs. Margaret Ballinger, M.P. (a representative of the Natives), Dr. the Hon. Edgar Brookes of the Senate, and Alan Paton, the author of *Cry, the Beloved Country*. The most fearless and uncompromising champion of the Africans is a priest of the same communion, the Rev. Michael Scott.

It is significant that a pamphlet published a year ago by the Christian Council and entitled *The Churches' Judgment against Apartheid* contained anti-segregation pronouncements by the leaders of all the

churches, the Dutch Reformed Churches excepted. Even the latter, it should be admitted, sponsor *apartheid* (of the vertical segregation variety) because they sincerely, though impractically, believe such a policy to be in the best interests of the Africans and Coloreds in the direction of separate development. The Congregationalists take pride in having elected as their Chairman in recent years a Colored minister (C. W. Hendrickse), the Presbyterians in having established, without schism, a Bantu Presbyterian Church, and the Methodists in having reaped a larger Non-European harvest of souls than any other communion in South Africa. If missionaries are unpopular in South Africa (where they are stigmatized as *kaffir-boeties* or black men's pals), it is because the splendid tradition of Philip, Gray, Moffat, Lindley, Livingstone and MacKenzie lives on in Alan Paton—in Senator Edgar Brookes—in the McCord Zulu Hospital—in Dr. Ray Phillips etc. In this ultra-chromatic land, missionaries remain, for the most part, resolutely color-blind.

The churches and missionary societies have stimulated a reluctant State to provide increasingly onerous subsidies for Non-European education. In 1936, for instance, the churches defrayed 13 per cent of the entire cost of African education. The quality of the education offered in such Native educational institutions

as Lovedale (Presbyterian), Healdtown (Methodist), Tiger Kloof (Congregational), Marianhill (Roman Catholic), St. Matthew's (Anglican), and Adams College (American Board) is the equal of the best European state schools in the land. The great need of the European churches is at the local level, where the inter-racial nature of the Christian fellowship should be demonstrated.

NOTABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Four universities, where the language medium is English, have made notable contributions to Non-European higher education. The Universities of Cape Town and the Witwatersrand (Johannesburg) have included a considerable number of Africans, Coloreds and Indians amongst their graduates and these have attended lectures and worked in laboratories and libraries on a parity with white undergraduates. The University of Natal has recently established an impressive Non-European Medical School in Durban to implement the provisions already made for Non-Europeans in other faculties, but these undergraduates meet in segregated classes. There is also a most important University College at Fort Hare for Non-Europeans (though it is called The South African Native College, it also provides for Coloreds and Indians as well as Africans). This is an affiliated institution of Rhodes

University, Grahamstown. In 1946 Fort Hare students were being prepared for the examinations of the federal University of South Africa and of the 324 candidates, 260 were Africans, 35 were Coloreds and 29 were Indians. Some members of the staff are distinguished Africans.

The present government threatened to remove Non-European students from the predominantly European Universities of Cape Town and the Witwatersrand recently, but bowed to the storm raised by the National Union of Students and the University authorities. The university Departments of the Social Sciences (and particularly of Social Anthropology) are performing a useful task as catalysts of racial prejudice. Any future party that might be founded on liberal racial lines would find strong and sympathetic support from most of the universities.

A most important contribution to the alleviation of racial tensions is being made by the South African Institute of Race Relations. Founded in 1929, its Director is Mr. Quintin Whyte, who succeeded Dr. Rheinallt Jones in that responsible post. This is a non-political, fact-finding organization which is slowly producing a nucleus of well-informed public opinion on race issues. It enlists the active support of anthropologists, lawyers, missionaries and the most tolerant leaders of the Non-European races. Under the aegis of the Insti-

tute, Joint European and African Councils have been formed in most of the leading cities and towns of the Union, which provide facilities for both races to discuss common problems in an attitude of understanding. The measure of the Institute's success is the foundation of S.A.B.R.A., an Afrikaner opposition concern, with its headquarters in Stellenbosch. So far, the latter is a fact-finding organization to the extent that it looks for facts to substantiate its theses!

SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

Other straws in the wind of the Spirit are the increasing sense of responsibility for other races shown by such enlightened municipalities as Port Elizabeth (our Motoropolis), with their fine housing-schemes for Africans, and by the demand of patrician industrialists that the Africans shall be trained as skilled workers and thus add to the national income and, incidentally, increase the sum available for educational and social services to their own people. Furthermore, although the Government appears to halt between two opinions, South Africa expended 16.5 million pounds sterling on Non-European education in 1946, which represents a greater amount *per capita* than was devoted to this purpose by any other British territory in Africa.

Even allowing for all the factors of faith, which are considerable in their cumulative effect, the situation

is grave and it will probably become graver before it improves. It is the high privilege of Christians in South Africa, in combination with all men and women of good-will, to demonstrate—even as a valiant and despised

minority—that “perfect love casts out fear.” In that task they need the informed concern of the Christians of the world outside, for they belong, in a double sense, to the Church *militant*.



Nature of Parody

There is another odd paradox or ambivalence in the muse of parody, when she is really herself. She wears a mask of derision, but behind the mask the face is crinkled in a smile of sneaking sympathy and admiration. The sneer on her false lips is belied by the twinkle of her peering eyes. She has the stance of a policewoman, but she is actually an Olympian Wac on Hallowe'en leave. The egg she throws is not rotten, but fresh—perhaps in both senses of the word; she throws it, not in malice, but in corrective fun; and it spatters, not besmirchingly on the author and his next, but harmlessly, with the colorful and antic burst of Chinese firecrackers, in the reader's comic imagination, if he has one—and God help him if he hasn't!—*Joe Lee Davis in THOUGHT, New York, N. Y., Summer, 1953.*

Little Way of St. Therese

Part of the heroism of the “little way” is that it calls for a silent, continued endurance. All of Thérèse's sacrifices were small (at least apparently) but they were constant. And most of us have had the experience of being able to rise to a difficult occasion but finding ourselves bogged down by a very petty annoyance of daily living, especially if it continues over any length of time. It may be foolish to cry over spilt milk, but it requires heroism *never* to cry over spilt milk, never to yield to discouragement over the trifling upsets and misunderstandings of human existence, never to refuse to recognize in the difficulties that befall us the loving touch of God's hand. To adore God's Will in everything that happens to us all day long is a great proof of our love for Him. I heard recently of a woman with seven small children who is without hot water and has had to do all her washing in cold water over a period of many months. All I could think to myself was what a wonder she would be if she never once griped about it!—*Dorothy Dohen in INTEGRITY, New York, N. Y., November, 1952.*

Fabian Essays, Old and New

V. A. DEMANT

Canon of Christ Church, Oxford

Reprinted from CURRENT RELIGIOUS THOUGHT*

USEFUL way of trying to understand what has happened in England over the first half of the twentieth century is to compare two representative pieces of social criticism in the same tradition, from the beginning and the end of that period. And we could not find better samples for this comparison than the *Fabian Essays in Socialism* of 1899 and the *New Fabian Essays* published this year. Two details are worth noting at the outset. There is first the phenomenal success of the original *Fabian Essays* as a publication; through sixty years it has continued to sell in large numbers in various languages and the latest edition has four prefaces, two by Bernard Shaw and one by Sidney Webb. The second fact to notice is that in his 1931 preface Shaw announced a forthcoming second set of Fabian essays on the constitutional machinery required for Socialism. This promise has not been fulfilled until 1952 although the Fabian Society has issued a large number of publications.

When we look at *New Fabian Es-*

says, we find that they have remained faithful to the Fabian theory in its two main characteristics. There is the same conviction that changes required by Socialism could be brought about by steady education and pressure, without a revolutionary upheaval—from which they got their name after Fabius Maximus, the Roman dictator, nicknamed the cautious, because of his waiting opportunism in the war with Hannibal. The new essayists are also at one with their precursors in believing that social justice requires public ownership of productive property and that the only way of making it public is to vest it in the state or municipalities.

The early Fabians, the best known of whom were Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb and Graham Wallas, were deeply concerned about the social evils in the wake of industrialism and for them the cure was Socialism, by which they meant the application of democracy to the economic side of life. Proletarianism was one of those evils: that is, the complete lack of status and security in the artisan pop-

* Oberlin, Ohio, November-December, 1952

ulation, whose only title to participation in the wealth of society was the selling of their labor at a market price. Another was their grossly small share in the growing wealth of the nation. Then there was the continued threat of unemployment and the recurring danger of production ceasing through too little buying power in the masses. The remedy for all this was to be public ownership and change in the electoral system.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

The *New Fabian Essays* of 1952, edited by Richard Crossman and with a preface by Clement Attlee, show a loyal adherence to the Fabian theory, to its gradualness of method and its insistence upon state ownership of productive capital. But they do not say much about these two planks in the theory. There are incidental references, as where they assert that their program has been more successful in approaching economic equality than revolutions elsewhere. Shaw had often said this in the years between. As to public ownership, the new Fabian essayist repeats that more nationalization will be required. This, it seems to me, is not said so confidently; it is rather as if they remembered that it ought to be in somewhere for theoretical loyalty's sake and a good place to bring it in is after wrestling with questions that still baffle the writer.

There is a certain admirable can-

dor about *New Fabian Essays*. Their writers—seven out of the eight have been Labor members of Parliament—allow that they have to see their theory in a situation very different from the one in which *Fabian Essays* were written, that some of the positions there taken have to be abandoned and that new problems unforeseen by their predecessors have to be faced. They are honest enough to say that at many points they must be content with asking the right questions or with indicating where further knowledge is needed. Socialism, says Richard Crossman, does not now need a crusade but a critical attitude, especially towards the two rival world forces of Soviet imperialism and American free-enterprise politics.

That is a pity for the sake of the program because Socialism has always been strongest when it has been a moral crusade for justice and weakest when it has tried to be scientific either by aligning itself with an alleged process of social evolution or by offering itself as the correct key for unfettering the industrial process. In these forms Socialism is always liable to set-backs and bewilderment when history throws up new anti-democratic forces and when production is stimulated by other than collectivist measures.

Let us now look at the philosophy behind the Fabian theory. The original essayists make some assumptions which Mr. Crossman in his very able

opening chapter to the new volume has to correct. He points out that one cannot count, as they did, upon an inherent tendency in history making for social democracy or upon necessary contradictions in the capitalist economic system. He reminds his readers that freedom is an unusual growth, depending upon definite outlooks and circumstances which have to be cultivated, maintained and defended; and that a cooperative commonwealth does not come automatically from greater knowledge of social facts. It throws an interesting light upon the intellectual atmosphere of the first Fabian essays to note how Sidney Webb took for granted that greater knowledge of society as an organism would lead men to democratic Socialism; how William Clarke said it would come from awareness of what the industrial revolution means; how Graham Wallas believed that associated production and consumption was being brought about by a law of causation which made socialized property inevitable—a law which was being applied even by men who rejected Socialist ideas; how Sidney Olivier said that the very facts of the time were destroying the tradition of the capitalist class.

These men believed that community consciousness was growing by a natural law of social development, and found that it was fortified by increasing state control and administration in the nineteenth century it-

self. I have been at some pains myself to show in a recent book that this was an error—a pardonable one due to their being children of their own age. The community consciousness which they thought was emerging through the dislocations of the capitalist era and would eventually overcome them—this was in fact a surviving force from pre-capitalist ages. It was still there in the nineteenth century but dwindling and the twentieth-century Socialist programs in the industrialist West have to find a way of re-creating it; it cannot be counted on as a basis.

A NEW PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIALISM

Now comes Mr. Crossman in 1952 offering a new philosophy of Socialism. He has to tell his readers and his movement that the egoisms in human nature are not eradicated by time, and that "original sin" may be a surer axiom on which to build checks upon greed and power than the optimistic evolutionary doctrine of the last century. There is now a need, he declares, to create a social morality and hints that it can be done with a social conscience cultivated by a minority as was the passion for freedom by the older liberals. I believe he is right in this but it is an ironical conclusion to a period where the Fabians have found so much of their program realized, not only by support given to their aims from the

healthy bad-conscience in elements of all classes, but also by changes and theories which were not of Socialist origin.

The authors of *New Fabian Essays* are quite frank in the assertions that those forces which have helped to bring about some of their aims, such as full employment, greater equality, central planning, have also made difficulties for democracy, which they are sincerely anxious to retain as an attribute of their Socialism. So Mr. Crossman regards the Fabian task today as that of developing a social morality to prevent the control of life and thought by centralized coercion or, as he puts it, to civilize the managerial society.

GAINS AND PROBLEMS

Here then is the situation the new Fabians attend to. It consists of their gains and their problems. The gains are acknowledged as full employment, a great measure of equality by redistributive taxation and central planning. The problems they deal with are four. First, how to prevent the concentration of power in the hands of industrial managers (not owners, please note) or of state bureaucracy; secondly, how to enable England to pay its way in the world with a weaker trade position and to raise the standard of living; thirdly, how to preserve Britain's independence in the conflict of international tensions; and fourthly, how to create a true

social consciousness which will make for cooperative energy.

On the first of these problems they do not have much to say though they state the need. Mr. Crosland in his chapter on "The Transition from Capitalism" says that the aims of Socialism are not now to be pursued by further extensions of free social services, by more nationalization of whole industries with a multiplication of public boards, by the continued proliferation of controls or by further redistribution of income by taxation. Instead he proposes more redistribution of property so that the wealthier cannot keep up social inequalities by spending out of capital; then he wants much more egalitarianism in education and, above all, an improvement in the psychology of industrial relations.

All would agree with this last requirement but many may well doubt whether it would be facilitated by the large-scale extension of public ownership that is recommended in view of the experience of already state-owned industries and the continued collective-bargaining mentality of the trade unions. There is, I think, more to be said for the reform of company law which is advocated by Mr. Crosland and by Mr. Albu in his chapter on "The Organization of Industry" in order to define the responsibilities of the firm to the worker, the consumer and the community, and so that workers would become members of the

company and have their representatives on the board of directors. It is odd, however, to find slipped in here the assumption that control is in the hands of shareholders alone when several of the contributors go out of their way to make clear that control has passed from ownership to management and technical experts.

"OWNERSHIP FOR ALL"

Here we reach a crucial point, this one of workers' participation in ownership. It is crucial not only for people like myself, who have always felt the wrong of the proletarian situation where the mass of workpeople have no share in the property of the corporate entities they work for and therefore no status as artisans. It is crucial also for the re-creation of a responsible community spirit, which these writers admit is still to be sought in spite of the large displacement of market economy by social controls. There is no doubt that the problem of "ownership for all" is a very difficult one. It is difficult because of the size of industrial units and their complicated interconnections; it is difficult because men, with the fear of insecurity still there, are naturally unwilling to share risks as well as profits. But it is the more difficult because the whole movement of thought and action for responsible status and ownership has been by-passed by the State Socialism of the Fabians themselves.

I notice in the introduction to this volume that the chairman of the group responsible for it—who I presume was G. D. H. Cole—resigned owing to a basic disagreement on policy. I hope it was on this point. If that is the case, then Professor Cole has stood out for what many had hoped would emerge before, namely, his conviction that the workers' movement made its greatest mistake in seeking to become masters in the state instead of in their own house of industry.

As a moralist I believe that no one's personality can be fully developed unless in his work he has three things: a sense of doing something worth while for its own sake—pride in the job, if you like; secondly, a knowledge that he is serving others; and in the third place, a real feeling of partnership in the enterprise. Modern industrial society has made the first two very difficult to realize, namely, first to "serve the work" as Miss Dorothy Sayers puts it: that is, to find excellence in doing it well apart from its earning power and usefulness; and second, to see how one's job is serving others, doing what the community needs and needs most at any particular time. To justify an economic activity just because it provides employment is not a criterion of service. But it is the third need of partnership which no modern regime, Socialist or capitalist, has succeeded in meeting and I would not be

hard on any movement for not seeing the way towards it.

But it does seem to me that *New Fabian Essays* are still too much caught in the Webb (I mean the man) of the original essays, in their faith that cooperative ownership and management can come on the far side of State Socialism. It will not do to argue that more nationalization will bring it without raising the question whether the whole development of state ownership has not prevented it. It is true of course that a working population now will prefer nationalization, for that means where there are losses on a non-productive industry the taxpayer stands the racket. The writers, especially Mr. Albu and Mr. Mikardo in his discussion of "Trade Unions in a Full Employment Economy," know the difficulties in the way of workers themselves desiring participation in ownership. Besides, union officials are reluctant to undertake any place on national boards for fear of losing their leadership in collective bargaining.

Another reason why State Socialism has by-passed and hindered serious thought on the question of owning-partnership in industry is that it has now given men a spurious sense of economic status as citizens, by nationalization and social services and re-distributive taxation; but this is not a stimulating substitute for significance and partnership in work. Loyalty to the community as a whole

in the modern national state is too abstract to engender a feeling of common purpose and participation. It may turn out that to offer men a stake in the nation instead of in their work and its instruments has been a very insidious form of "opium for the people."

I have dealt with this question at some length because I think that the new Fabian essayists see the need but do not know the measures required and possible for its application. No one can blame them for that; it is a baffling problem everywhere at this stage of industrial development. But I would criticize them for repeating the slogans of nationalization and equality as if a further dose of these will facilitate real participation, or revive the instinct for it where it is atrophied. In this matter the thought of the new Fabians is not as new as it ought to be.

PROBLEMS FOR BRITAIN

But I have to say that on some other matters they show a real appreciation of the present situation and the problems it presents to Britain. They have quite got away from the idea that mankind becomes more international as it becomes more industrial and commercial. The first Fabian essayists, with the possible exception of Bernard Shaw, shared this idea with Herbert Spencer and Richard Cobden. In the book I am reviewing there is a clear recognition

that industrial commercialism produces its own international tensions and rivalries and that these are political as well as economic. I wish its authors had been as realistic in criticism of the idea, which they still seem to share with their predecessors, that as societies become more democratic they become more cooperative with one another. Recent history seems to have shown that the reverse is the case. The world has never exhibited such a shutting down of international intercourse as in the present era of increasing popular governments. Any new thought on the problem of democratic Socialism ought surely to have examined this seriously. This does not appear in *New Fabian Essays* but there is a good statement of two new problems which were not in the purview of the early Fabians.

One is the worsening of Britain's position in the world trading economy, whereby more effort is required here to procure the food and materials for the increasing wealth it is proposed to distribute more widely. This was not a problem for the original Fabians, for they relied upon a continuation of Britain's advantageous position. Mr. Crosland and Mr. Healey, among the new writers, state the position very clearly though they do not clinch the argument with the inevitable conclusion that whereas in the early period the cheapest way of getting our primary necessities was to export manufactures for them, now it

is fast becoming the most expensive way.

The second thing which has forced itself on the awareness of these contemporary writers is the fact of power in social and international relations. This is forcefully dealt with by Denis Healey in the chapter on "Power Politics and the Labor Party." The older Fabians, and many left-wing idealists since, never appreciated the place of power conflicts in international affairs; they believed that power relations would be superseded by moral and brotherly ones, once economic disharmonies were ironed out. This led to a certain pacifist temper and to a simple faith that if the peoples of the world got nearer to one another and more alike, then greater harmony would ensue. Mr. Healey represents a more tough realism and he voices a new note among British Socialist intellectuals. He sees that a peaceful international system rests upon recognized common interests or a stable pattern of power, or both.

NOTE OF REALISM

Now on these two points, in which I find a new note of realism, namely, Britain's weak economic position in the world and the continued need of using power in the service of principle, the *New Fabian Essays* are not particularly Socialist in their insights. My general impression of the two sets of *New Fabian Essays*, looked at in comparison, is that where the new

writers are Socialist they tend to repeat *clichés* and where they are new in their thinking they are not specifically left-wing. The original *Fabian Essays* represented, you might say, an idea looking for a movement—which it got; *New Fabian Essays* represent a movement looking for an idea.

There is, however, really no dominant new idea emerging in these essays to cope with the two major problems of Britain at this stage of its industrial career. These two problems are concerned one with the physical basis of its economic life and the other with the more moral or spiritual task of re-creating a social consciousness which will work for the future and make the necessary uncomfortable adaptations. It is not that the new Fabian essayists are alone in not giving constructive attention to these things, but it is a defect in a group of thinkers who claim to be in the vanguard of enlightenment and to have shown up the true nature of economic and human realities, which they believe to have been disguised by the capitalist concern for profits.

ECONOMIC SURVIVAL

As to the conditions of our economic survival, their realism goes no further than exhortations, in unison with other political spokesmen, to earn our keep in the international trading system by the same economic strategy as before under capitalism. There is not more than a perfunctory word

about planning for a more balanced economy at home so that we could be less dependent for our food and primary necessities on the rising-price markets abroad. There is no suggestion that an old industrial country may be crushing out its remaining resources in land and spontaneous loyalties by extending factory production and urban subculture. There is no anxiety over labor and land and material used up in expensive and partly harmful luxuries like civil aviation, television, government premises and a host of activities in which men have found a place to tap the flow of money incomes when we are short of miners, farmers and fishermen. No indignation over shoddy and meretricious goods, like furniture collapsing within two years of the honeymoon. Shades of William Morris and John Ruskin! Where are they to shriek horror at the way modern Socialists accept the dreariest values of the seamier side of capitalist and *bourgeois* civilization.

The fact is that Socialist reformers have, like most of us, been so shaken and ashamed of the evils of mass unemployment that they believe full employment of any kind is to be welcomed. But it is a shocking neglect for a party which believes in planning to take no thought for real priorities and to show no suspicion that technical developments may cut off the biological and spiritual sources of renewal.

And what are we to say about a moral and spiritual recovery of the sense of community? The new Fabian writers know that this is a vital question. They have, however, only one panacea to offer; it is more equality. This is the burden of two essays, one by Roy Jenkins on economic equality and the other by Margaret Cole on education.

Of course if inequality is of a certain kind, as it was in the beginning of the industrial age, it breeds resentment and uncooperative attitudes, but it does not at all follow that income—and social equality—transform them into an urge to cooperate. These advocates of greater equality and a classless society might well learn from their colleagues who recognize that conflicts of interest and power occur as much between people who are alike as between disparate sections of society. And if they take seriously the alarm of other colleagues about the danger of centralized monopolies, they might well consider that the earlier radical movements which swept away absolute monarchies also undermined the functional and social hierarchies which had hitherto distributed power and held the central

authority in check. The dissolution of all differences is not an instrument of justice or contentment; it will only direct all resentments to the supreme authority.

You would expect something to be said on how to foster a community sense in the chapter on education. But Mrs. Cole, after saying the first question should be the kind of life we are training the young for, leaves it entirely alone and concentrates with vigor on how to get everybody educated in the same schools. I would only add that an education which will bring about a sense of cooperative enterprise will have to counteract much that our industrial culture does to people outside the teaching field. It would have to counteract, for example, the tendency to make "private worlds" encouraged by recreation at the cinema, the wireless and television, and to be quite frank in showing its pupils that they will not easily see that what they do in the modern world is of service to their families and neighbors in the concrete. In brief, training for democracy will mean a kind of ascetic correction of many things to which our civilization predisposes men.

Correction: The gremlins who inhabit magazine offices led us to attribute the editorial "Teen-aged Goldfish," which appeared in the February, 1953 issue of the CATHOLIC MIND to *Work*. That editorial was reprinted from the June, 1952 number of *Today*. To all concerned, our embarrassed apologies. EDITOR.

The University Takes Its Stand

THE REV. J. E. COOGAN, S. J.

This article appeared originally in pamphlet form under the auspices of the University of Detroit Development Office

WHEN the thirteen American colonies resolved to "go it alone," the Founding Fathers saw fit to justify their act by the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson, their spokesman, declared that "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation." In much the same spirit, in this its seventy-fifth year, the University of Detroit, an independent and privately supported institution in an increasingly government-dominated society, makes this declaration of its own purpose of insistent independence.

This university stands alone and independent because it was created to hand down from generation to generation a definite body of fundamental convictions for which it will make no compromise and can permit "no entangling alliances." To its students of one faith it transmits the beliefs of its accredited authorities, and believes that in so doing it is the benefactor of the entire community. But to all its students, no matter what their faith, it teaches with insistence and absolute conviction a concept of

life and government that is as American as is the Declaration of Independence. In fact the University of Detroit, contrary to an unfortunate trend in higher learning in this country, still takes its stand squarely on that Declaration and vindicates its teachings as proclaimed by Jefferson, subscribed to by the Founding Fathers, and declared by John Adams to have been "in the minds of us all."

Freedom to continue to vindicate that basic American spirit, unmoved by the educational moods of the passing hour, is abundant justification for the independent status of this University and is a compelling claim upon the support of friends of the original American spirit.

Unmoved by the educational moods of the passing hour! Most Americans, taken up with the business of earning a living, have little concept of the attacks being made in the learned world upon the "original American spirit." Most loyal citizens would as soon assail their own mothers as the Declaration of Independence. With the Declaration they acknowledge it "self-evident that all

men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men."

SELF-EVIDENT TRUTH

These convictions, held by most Americans as their birthright, are being assailed from one end of the collegiate world to the other. For a very large part of that world the Declaration, this most fundamental document in American life, is dubbed a rather inane mass of glittering generalities. As Professor Carl Becker of Cornell has said, what the Founding Fathers declared "self-evident truths" were in fifty years treated as little more than sophistry. The original manuscript of the Declaration may be dusted off and given a ride on the Freedom Train for the admiration of the hinterland on the occasion of a liberty bond drive or other national emergency. But the Declaration, the professors tell us, belongs to the nursery phase of our national development, before the days of the Great Enlightenment.

Here are a few samples of the prevailing professorial scorn. The first citation is from George Lundberg, who at the annual convention of the American Sociological Society in 1943 declared in his presidential address: "One would think that if re-

cent events had shown anything, they had shown that there are no such things as *inalienable* rights. The only rights we know about are those which a community from time to time chooses to grant and respect."

The well-known political scientist, Professor Chester C. Maxey, is equally as emphatic in his *Political Philosophies* (Macmillan, 1938, pp. 207, 208): "There are, of course, no such things as inherent and inalienable rights. They are purely a figment of the imagination, wish-fulfillment in political thinking."

A third quotation typical of the prevailing mood we have from Morris R. Cohen, an outstanding American philosopher of our generation and professor in half a dozen prominent universities, East and West. In an article in the *Philosophical Review* ("Jus Naturale Redivivum," November, 1916) he said:

To defend a doctrine of natural rights today requires either insensibility to the world's progress or else considerable courage in the face of it . . . everyone who enjoys the consciousness of being enlightened knows that doctrines of natural right of man are, and by right ought to be, dead. The attempt to defend a doctrine of natural rights before historians and political scientists would be treated very much like an attempt to defend the belief in witchcraft. It would be regarded as emanating only from the intellectual underworld . . .

In defiance of that scorn, the University of Detroit takes its stand with the Founding Fathers and de-

fends the Declaration of Independence as the most solid and worthy expression of political conviction that America has produced. With Montesquieu we hold that a nation's decadence begins when it loses sight of the principles on which it is founded. Hence the University feels that she deserves the generous support of loyal Americans when she continues to spend herself from generation to generation vindicating for her thousands of students the wisdom of our American government as first established.

Here then are some of the "self-evident truths" and "Creator-endowed rights" to which this University gives unfailing support today as throughout her history.

FREE WILL

Man is not merely the product of his heredity and environment. To a degree he is also the product of his own making. In his conduct he is no mere deterministic automaton, no "graven image pushed from behind." Despite the far too common testimony of the professorial world, as voiced by the influential criminologist Harry Elmer Barnes, this University holds that man *can* be "wilfully perverse"; the "multiple murderer" is to be held accountable, as the "amiable and generous benefactor" is *not*. It is pure materialistic dogma to say (with Barnes): "There is not the slightest iota of choice al-

lowed to any individual from birth to the grave." It is as right scientifically as it is traditionally American to proclaim: *I am the captain of my soul!*

This University too is in full accord with the death-bed warning of George Washington: "Beware of the man who attempts to inculcate morality without religion." She believes that there is an essential, Creator-imposed morality, shown by the nature of things. Hence, because all men have essentially the same human nature, none may be used as a mere means to the end of another. Not all morals are relative, to be determined by the relationship of conduct to a man-made objective. Hence the wilful destruction of the innocent is murder no matter by whom performed or for whose convenience. Not "all morality is custom made." Some things are right, some wrong by their very nature. No Kinsey Report of sexual promiscuity can make the violation of marriage vows anything else than adultery, to be morally deplored.

The standards of sexual morality were promulgated by the Creator through nature. Sexual promiscuity is as truly contrary to God-given nature as is perversion or incest. We agree with the cured-Communist Freda Utey (after her six years of Moscow horror), that "Some standards of absolute morality are necessary to mankind if we are not to re-

turn to the life of the brute." But we hold that those standards are to be found in nature as it comes from the hand of God; as every maker's will is found in the nature of the thing made.

Hence the University of Detroit, standing with the Founding Fathers' concept of natural law morality, rejects such a norm as that of the Mid-Western university professor Millard S. Everett, who recently stated:

Any desire whether powerful or weak, or any end whether chief or small, may with perfect morality be realized, and should be realized, providing it does not interfere with the realization of other desires to the extent of reducing the sum total of human satisfaction.

Quite aside from the impossibility of passion-filled youth judging of the effect of its indulgence upon the "sum total of human satisfaction," there is the Creator-promulgated code needed to keep us from returning "to the life of the brute." For the same reasons we are no more impressed with the New England Professor George P. Murdock's plea for a re-writing of the premarital moral code on the score of prevalent laxity, "the advent of contraception and the scientific mastery of venereal disease."

INDIVIDUAL HAS RIGHTS

With the Founding Fathers — and contrary to the all too prevalent academic thinking — this University denies that human rights are made by a majority vote. For us each human

being, no matter what his "race, color, or previous condition of servitude," has rights — and corresponding duties — from the God of nature, equal and inviolable. The Nazi-attempted extermination of entire peoples would have been no less a moral monstrosity had it been provided for by a majority vote. A majority can be as tyrannical as a minority, and is even more dangerous since less subject to appeal or control. Inviolability must be established for the deserving even though a minority of one. The rights of innocence to impunity we hold — with the Founding Fathers — are "unalienable." To secure these rights (as Jefferson wrote), "Governments are established among Men." This teaching alone is the bulwark — and the only bulwark — against Communism and Fascism alike.

Totalitarian forms of government are not moral evils merely because they won't "work"; they are tyrannical perversions by their very nature. The State was made by and for man, not man for the State. Civil government is in the very nature of things a necessary device for the cooperative satisfaction of man's needs and his protection from the arbitrary. Hence it is a part of the plan of the author of nature; and the rights of the State over the individual are from that same nature necessarily limited and constructive. To the "statist" such statements are of

course "laughter holding both its sides"; but nothing that science has shown us in the course of our national history suggests that they are not as self-evident and timeless as they are said to be in the Declaration of Independence.

One consequence of this University's concept of the State as "for the individual" is her repudiation of Marxist Socialism in all its forms. The cure for maldistribution of property is not *less* private property but *more*. State ownership of all productive property means State control of all living. Economic control means total control. The nineteenth-century Bishop Von Ketteler of Mainz was merely clear-sighted when he declared:

Even if all the Utopian dreams of the Socialists were realized, and every one was fed to his heart's content in this universal labor State, yet should I for all that prefer to eat in peace the potatoes planted by my hand and to be clothed with the skins of the animals I reared, and therewith *remain free*, than to fare sumptuously in the slavery of the labor State.

If present wealth concentration is an evil, at least it does not completely lock the door against its own gradual and orderly correction; whereas against the omnipotent State no resistance short of suicidal revolution is possible. Lord Acton's "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely" is no less true today because so frequently recalled.

"UNLESS GOD BUILD THE CITY . . ."

But the ultimate safeguard for all human rights, as well as the ultimate safeguard of government itself, the University of Detroit sees only in the spirit of religion. George Washington's warning in his Farewell Address is even more timely today than when spoken a century and a half ago: "Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." Religion must spread her influence if the spreading corruption in government is not to endanger our very national existence. When the embittered convict's universal sneer, "Everybody has his racket," comes to wear more than a semblance of truth, America will be in danger. The duties of office-holding and citizenship alike must be envisioned as based on religion, to be lived out as a matter of conscience between man and his God rather than through fear of wire-tapping, marked money, or a Kefauver investigation. Walter Lippmann spoke only solemn truth when he reminded us all:

The liberties we talk about defending today were established by men who took their conception of man from the great central religious tradition of Western civilization, and the liberties we inherit can almost certainly not survive the abandonment of that tradition.

In final explanation of her reason

for independent being, the University of Detroit, one of the largest privately supported universities in the old Northwest Territory, cites a passage of the 1787 Ordinance by which that Territory was originally established: "Religion, morality and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

MAN'S OBLIGATIONS

In this University, the obligations of man to God and to his fellow men are taught today as in the Detroit of elm-lined streets of seventy-five years ago. The moral standards of the "dear dead days beyond recall" are vindicated even as in the days of the Founding Fathers, although on all sides principles of conduct seem to melt and run. And knowledge, including both the findings of true science and the principles of sound philosophy — the "self-evident truths" of the Founding Fathers — are in this University completely at home, rather than what Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes lamented as the "experiments in negations" breeding "increasing skepticism of patriotic values." Our campus is no producer of young cynics, knowing the "cost of everything and the value of nothing." Idealistic youth is not here left to learn life's values through the bitter experience of straggling back deflowered from a Volga boat ride.

We do not in this University refuse the name knowledge to everything outside the findings of the laboratory; for we are convinced that "there is a difference between truth and falsity, good and bad, and that truth, goodness and right are objective standards even though they cannot be experimentally verified." In our opinion, as in that of Robert Maynard Hutchins, the restriction of the term knowledge to the field of experimental verification has brought with it "despair because the keys which were to open the gates of heaven have led us into a larger but more oppressive prison house." Professor Carl Becker of Cornell University characterized the change in concept of life's meaning produced by the secular spirit as a replacement of the "conception of existence as a divinely composed and purposeful drama by the conception of existence as a blindly running flux of disintegrating energy."

LIFE'S MEANING

The University of Detroit firmly takes its stand on the religious concept of life's meaning.

Man is the unique creature of the Omnipotent God; all men are brothers under the Fatherhood of God.

The relationships of men, their rights and duties, are based on the divine plan and are in conscience imposed. Moral decision can be rationally arrived at.

In the light of man's spiritual nature and eternal destiny, his educational needs can be known and adequately supplied. It is only because of blindness self-inflicted that educators need confess, with John Dewey: "We agree that we are uncertain as to where we are going and where we want to go, and why we are doing what we do." Blindness has no more

justification in education than in industry, and promises no more worthy product.

The product which the University of Detroit deliberately plans is, and will continue to be, one that is not alien to the thoughts of the Founding Fathers, because both are products of the "great central religious tradition of Western civilization."



Catholic Colleges and Science

We can no longer afford the enormous waste that arises when a potential scientific giant is lost in the crowd. Those very few intellects, capable of doing pioneering work on the frontiers of science, must be identified, encouraged and nurtured. They must be equipped morally and intellectually so that they may go on to more advanced studies and fruitful work. Would that the ratio of genius to average mind was as high as 1 in 140. If such special and painstaking efforts are not taken, our Catholic educational process will fail not only the relatively few gifted minds entrusted to it, but the larger, less gifted but equally precious body of our students. In this atomic age it is essential to gain and retain significant Catholic participation in intellectual leadership in the experimental sciences. We need new Potamians, new Mendels, new Pascals, new Pupins and Marconis as Catholic gifts to this century.—*Commissioner Thomas E. Murray at the Centennial Anniversary of Manhattan College, April 25, 1953.*

Curbs on Economic Freedom

Economic freedom—like the other freedoms of man—must, in order to endure, be subjected to controls. More fitting would it be to human nature if capitalists and workers were themselves to exercise restraint upon their own economic freedom. That this ideal be even partially realized, it is an absolute condition for individual men to be imbued with a vital awareness of God and of the dignity which He has bestowed upon each and every human being. Flowing from this awareness would be a willingness to respect each other's rights. Unfortunately, the secularism of American society cannot provide such self-imposed controls. America, therefore, must reject secularism. Otherwise, it is doomed to a reign of economic jungle fighters or to a statism of totalitarian bureaucrats.—*THE MAGNIFICAT, Manchester, N. H., March-April, 1953.*

How I Entered the Church

THOMAS BRADY

*Professor of History and Vice President of the
University of Missouri*

*Reprinted from THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY**

IT IS not easy to tell in a short article why I became a Catholic. But I became one as a result of my own free choice and I ought to be able to tell why I did. Some distinguished converts to the Catholic Faith have written books and articles explaining step by step how they wandered for years in darkness and finally found the light. I have not read many of these books but I have read what is probably the greatest one—the one written by St. Augustine over fifteen hundred years ago. But this is my story and I am going to try to tell briefly and clearly why I entered the Catholic Church.

The first reason, as I see it now, is that I couldn't find God anywhere else. From the time I entered college in 1920 until I entered the Church in 1947, I was constantly looking for Him. Sometimes, like the great Catholic poet Francis Thompson, I was running away from Him. He says it beautifully in *The Hound of Heaven*:
*"I fled Him, down the nights and
down the days;*

*I fled Him, down the arches of the
years;
I fled Him, down the labyrinthine
ways
Of my own mind; And in the midst
of tears
I hid from Him, and under running
laughter."*

But mostly I was looking. I read a great deal about the history of Christianity, since I am a teacher of history by profession. And as I shall indicate, my study of history had a great deal to do with my entering the Church, but I didn't find God in the history books. I found God in the Catholic Church. I had looked for Him for over twenty-five years and when I found Him I was surprised that I had looked everywhere but where He was.

I went to Mass for thirteen years before I entered the Church, although I was never in a Catholic church until I was twenty-two years old. I remember the occasion well—it was at Midnight Mass in Holy Cross Cathedral, Boston, Christmas, 1924, and a friend

* Techny, Ill., April, 1953.

of mine from St. Paul took me. It seemed strange to me. When I married a Catholic in 1934, I began to go to Mass regularly.

At first I was interested in the liturgy, primarily as a branch of scholarship. I had studied Latin in school and was delighted with Church Latin. I was eager to learn all I could about the Mass. I studied it and read some books on its history.

As time went on, without my knowing it, I began to go beyond this historical and scholarly interest. I felt somehow that I had missed something if I didn't go to Mass. Other changes came, too. I had Protestant knees and couldn't see how anyone could kneel for longer than a few moments at a time. Also, I couldn't see how anyone could go without breakfast until he had been to church. These are small things but the point here is that I don't remember just when all this changed.

FOUND GOD IN THE HOLY SACRIFICE

When I finally entered the Church, that last step that had seemed so hard to take was very easy. I felt that I wasn't ready—that I didn't know enough and should study several years more. But the priest was right when he said to me, "You're ready, Tom," and in I went. For, although I didn't realize it even then, the Mass had changed entirely from what I first thought it was. Every word, every act, began to have meaning—

not as history or scholarship, or ritual or liturgy. When I realized what had happened, I knew exactly what I had found in the Mass. God was there.

Now that may sound simple to many Catholics who have known it all the time, but I didn't know it—until I found Him. I think I couldn't have reached Him by study in a hundred years. Every convert has his own story, but this is mine. With me, nothing else seemed very important once I knew I had found God.

This wasn't an emotional thing. I couldn't have been convinced that way because I was reared in an emotional, evangelistic sect—one in which the call was supposed to come from God in a state of emotional fervor. I discarded that and couldn't ever go back to it. I wasn't looking for an emotional experience and I didn't find any.

The one thing I had to have, God's grace, the merciful Lord finally gave to me. It wasn't as sudden as St. Paul's conversion on the Damascus road, but it hit me just about as hard a jolt when I finally realized it. To show you what I mean: before this happened, I had several times wished I could believe. I thought I couldn't. I thought belief in God was a kind of mere act of the will—you just said you were going to believe or you were not. You took your choice. But it wasn't that way. It just became real and it is real.

Now there are some other things

that bear on the whole matter. These things have to do with explanations, satisfactions, and why I know it wasn't just an emotional experience. One thing that attracted me powerfully to the Church for many years was its high respect for reason. I was brought up in a Protestant tradition that had adopted Martin Luther's famous phrase about reason. Luther is supposed to have said, "Reason is a harlot who knows naught of the ways of God."

I couldn't believe that. To me religion and God Himself had to satisfy reason since reason was the ordinary human means of arriving at truth. I remember reading in the paper a year or so ago about an Episcopalian minister who became a Catholic and a few years later became an Episcopalian again. He said the Catholic Church was too coldly rational for him; he wanted an emotional religion. I know what he meant but that wasn't what I wanted. The first time I got into some of St. Thomas I knew I had hit the real thing. But intellectual conviction and conversion are not the same thing—at least they were not in my case. Long before I entered the Church, I could have signed my name to every item in the Creed and in the catechism. I was intellectually convinced.

I was convinced in other ways, too. In my study of history, it became clear to me early that the Catholic Church was the one true Church. His-

tory proves it down to the hilt. I was convinced of that many years before I entered the Church. Again, intellectual conviction. As a matter of fact, it was so clear to me, as a historian, that I presented it to my classes in history long before I was in the Church. I know a man who is a convert who says that he first got interested in the Church in a class of mine and he got into the Church before I did.

I have been a college professor for twenty-five years and ought to be able to tell how it happened that I became a Catholic. I ought to be able to say something that would help bring others into the Church, but I realize that I haven't been able to say much that throws any light on the process. And I have noticed the same thing in reading the story of other converts. Some of them can write well and can give at great length the things that bothered them and how they found the answers to their questions and problems.

READ THE RIGHT BOOKS

I had a lot of questions and problems to deal with in the early stages. That is where reading the right books can help. I got a lot from Father Conway's *Question Box*. I have given away several copies to others who have questions. The other writers who helped me most were Cardinal Newman and Chesterton. Newman was a bit over my head when I first tackled him and one of his books, *The Gram-*

mar of Assent, I started three times before I got through it. Chesterton's *Everlasting Man* impressed me a great deal and many of his other books helped me along also. But the friend of mine who called my attention to this book and to many others is still outside the Church. He has been intellectually convinced for years and knows more about the teachings of the Church than I do. What can I do for him? I can't teach him anything; he is completely convinced from an intellectual point of view. The thing I can do that may help him is, I believe, to pray for him. I know somebody was praying for me.

Concerning this we have a harmless joke at our house. When a man or woman who has married a Catholic comes into the Church, we are amused when people say that the wife or husband brought the other in by coaxing, complaining, or insisting. We know that the wife or husband or the children *prayed* the other party in. I think it worked in my case—my wife and the children prayed me in.

It may be a bit gratuitous to assign causation for a miraculous event. But conversion, in my experience, is not a bolt of lightning. The grace of God works, but I didn't see any pillars of fire or have any sudden seizures. That's why not only the prayers but also the acts of others can help God's work. The human being who helped me most in both ways was my wife. Next comes the priest who instructed

me before my marriage. My wife and I were married by a Dominican priest and he gave me, a non-Catholic, only one word of advice. He said: "You will learn a lot about faith living with a good Catholic." How right he was! Only the most perverse person could live with a good Catholic for years and not have a tremendous attraction toward the Church. The children helped, too. The Sisters were teaching me as they taught my children. The first Catechism I ever saw was brought home by one of them.

A non-Catholic who has no religion of his own needs, first, something to stimulate interest, answer questions, and create a desire to learn more. I got some of this from books, but those who are not professors can get it in many ways. One of the finest aids is the series of pamphlets issued by the Religious Information Bureau of the Knights of Columbus. There are many others, but these are advertised far and wide through the program carried on by the Knights.

I certainly don't think my own case is a unique one. If God's grace got me down the aisle to the rail, it will get others down there, too, once they step inside the front door. But you and I have got to bring them to the front door of the church or the rectory where they can see the priest. If God can handle the big part of the process, as He can, we ought to be able to do the easier job of getting them where He can reach them.

Documentation

Psychotherapy and Religion

POPE PIUS XII

An address to the Fifth International Congress of Psychotherapy and Clinical Psychology, April 13, 1953.

WE GREET you, dear sons and daughters, who have come from all parts and are gathered together in Rome to listen to learned expositions and discuss questions of psychotherapy and clinical psychology. Your Congress has ended, and, in order to guarantee its results and the success of your research and future activities, you have come to receive the blessing of the Vicar of Christ. Very gladly do We respond to your desire and We avail Ourselves of this occasion to address to you a word of encouragement and to give you some advice.

Science affirms that recent observations have brought to light the hidden layers of the psychic structure of man, and it tries to understand the meaning of these discoveries, to interpret them and render them capable of use. People speak of dynamisms, determinisms and mechanisms hidden in the depths of the soul, endowed with immanent laws whence are derived certain modes of acting. Undoubtedly these begin to operate within the subconscious or the unconscious, but they also penetrate into the realms of the conscious and determine it. People claim to have devised methods that have been tried and recognized as adequate to scrutinize the mystery of the depths of the soul, to elucidate them and put them back on the right road when they are exercising a harmful influence.

These questions, which lend themselves to the examination of scientific psychology, belong to your competence. The same may be said for the use of new psychic methods. But theoretical and practical psychology, the one as much as the other, should bear in mind that they cannot lose sight of the truths established by reason and by faith, nor of the obligatory precepts of ethics.

Last year, in the month of September, acceding to the wishes of members of the First International Congress of Histopathology of the Nervous System, We indicated the moral limits of medical methods of research and treatment.¹ On the basis of that explanation, We would like today to add something by way of complement. Briefly, We intend to outline the

¹ See *Catholic Mind*, LI, 1085, (May, 1953), pp. 305-313.

fundamental attitude which is imposed upon the Christian psychologist and psychotherapist.

This fundamental attitude can be summed up in the following formula: Psychotherapy and clinical psychology must always consider man 1) as a psychic unit and totality, 2) as a structured unit in itself, 3) as a social unit, and 4) as a transcendent unit, that is to say, a unit tending towards God.

I. MAN AS A PSYCHIC UNIT AND TOTALITY

Medicine has learned to consider the human body as a mechanism of great precision, whose parts fit into each other and are connected to each other. The place and the characteristics of these parts are dependent on the whole. They serve its existence and its functions. But this conception is more applicable still to the soul, whose delicate wheels have been assembled with much more care. The various psychic faculties and functions form part of the whole spiritual being and subordinate themselves to its final end.

It is useless to develop this point further. But you, psychologists and psychic healers, must bear this fact in mind: the existence of each psychic faculty and function is explained by the end of the whole man. What constitutes man is principally the soul, the substantial form of his nature. From it, ultimately, flows all the vital activity of man. In it are rooted all the psychic dynamisms with their own proper structure and their organic law. It is the soul which nature charges with the government of all man's energies, in so far as these have not yet acquired their final determination.

Given this ontological and psychological fact, it follows that it would be a departure from reality to attempt, in theory or in practice, to entrust the determining role of the whole to one particular factor, for example, to one of the elementary psychic dynamisms, and thus install a secondary power at the helm. Those psychic dynamisms may be *in* the soul, *in* man. They are not, however, the soul nor the man. They are energies of considerable intensity perhaps, but nature has entrusted their direction to the center-post, to the spiritual soul endowed with intellect and will, which is normally capable of governing these energies. That these energies may exercise pressure upon one activity does not necessarily signify that they compel it. To deprive the soul of its central place would be to deny an ontological and psychic reality.

It is not possible, therefore, when studying the relationship of the ego to the dynamisms that compose it, to concede unreservedly in theory the autonomy of man—that is, of his soul—but to go on immediately to state that in the reality of life this theoretical principle appears to be very frequently set aside or minimized to the extreme. In the reality of life, it is argued, man always retains his freedom to give his internal consent to what he does, but in no way the freedom to do it. The autonomy of free will is replaced by the heteronomy of instinctive dynamism. That is not the way in which God fashioned man.

Original sin did not take away from man the possibility or the obligation

of directing his own actions himself through his soul. It cannot be alleged that the psychic troubles and disorders which disturb the normal functioning of the psychic being represent what usually happens. The moral struggle to remain on the right path does not prove that it is impossible to follow that path, nor does it authorize any **drawing back**.

II. MAN AS A STRUCTURED UNIT

Man is an ordered unit and whole, a microcosm, a sort of state whose charter, determined by the end of the whole, subordinates to this end the activity of the parts according to the true order of their value and function. This charter is, in the final analysis, of an ontological and metaphysical origin, not a psychological and personal one. There are those who have thought it necessary to accentuate the opposition between the metaphysical and the psychological. A completely wrong approach! The psychic itself belongs to the domain of the ontological and metaphysical.

We have recalled this truth to you in order to base on it a remark about man in the concrete, whose internal order is being here examined. Indeed, the effort has been made to establish a contradiction between traditional psychology and ethics relative to modern psychotherapy and clinical psychology.

Traditional psychology and ethics, it is affirmed, have for their object the abstract being of man, *homo ut sic* (man as such), who assuredly exists nowhere. The clarity and logical connection of these disciplines merit admiration, but they suffer from a basic fault. They are inapplicable to real man as he exists. Clinical psychology, on the contrary, deals with real man, with *homo ut hic*. And the conclusion is: between the two conceptions there opens an abyss impossible to surmount so long as traditional psychology and ethics do not change their position.

The study of the constitution of real man ought, in fact, to take as object "existential" man, such as he is, such as his natural dispositions, the influences of his milieu, education, his personal development, his intimate experiences and external events have made him. It is only man in the concrete that exists. And yet, the structure of this personal ego obeys in the smallest detail the ontological and metaphysical laws of human nature of which We have spoken above. They have formed it and thus should govern and judge it. The reason behind this is that "existential" man identifies himself in his inmost structure with "essential" man.

The essential structure of man does not disappear when individual notes are added to it. It is not further transformed in another human nature. But the constitution, of which We spoke just now, rests precisely in its principal terms on the essential structure of real man, man in the concrete.

Consequently, it would be erroneous to establish for real life norms which would deviate from natural and Christian morality, and which, for want of a better word, could be called "personalist ethics." The latter would without doubt receive a certain "orientation" from the former, but this would not admit of any strict obligation. The law of the structure of man in the concrete is not to be invented but applied.

III. MAN AS A SOCIAL UNIT

What We have said up to now concerns man in his personal life. The psychical includes also his relations with the exterior world, and a praiseworthy task, a field open to your researches, is found in the study of the psychic in its social aspects, in itself and in its roots, and to make it serviceable for the purposes of clinical psychology and of psychotherapy. But one should take good care in this to make a scrupulous distinction between the facts in themselves and their interpretation.

Social psychism touches also morality, and the principles of morality affect to a large extent those of serious psychology and psychotherapy. But there are some points where the application of social psychism sins by excess or by defect. And it is on this that We would briefly pause.

A. ERROR BY DEFECT

There is a psychological and moral disturbance—that of the inhibition of the ego—with which your science concerns itself in order to discover its causes. When this inhibition encroaches on the moral domain, as for instance, when there is question of dynamic tendencies, such as the instinct of domination, of superiority and the sexual instinct, psychotherapy would not be capable, without further considerations, of treating this inhibition of the ego as a kind of fatality, as a tyranny of the affective impulse streaming forth from the subconscious and escaping completely from the control of the conscious and of the soul. One should be slow to lower man in the concrete, together with his personal character, to the level of the brute.

Despite the good intentions of the therapists, sensitive natures bitterly resent this degradation to the level of instinctive and sensitive life. Furthermore, the observations We have made above on the hierarchy of values among the functions and the role of their central direction should not be disregarded.

A word also on the method sometimes employed by the psychologist to liberate the ego of its inhibition in the case of aberration in the sexual domain. We refer to complete sexual initiation, which would not pass over anything in silence, leave nothing in obscurity. Is there not therein a harmful overestimation of knowledge in these matters?

There is also an efficacious sexual education which, in entire safety, teaches with calmness and objectivity what the young man should know for his own personal conduct and his relationship with those with whom he is brought into contact. For the rest, the accent will be placed principally, in sexual education—as moreover, in all education—upon self-mastery and religious training. The Holy See published certain norms in this connection shortly after the Encyclical of Pius XI on Christian marriage (Holy Office, March 21, 1931, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, vol. 23, p. 118). These norms have not been rescinded, neither expressly nor *via facti* (by way of fact).

What has just been said of inconsiderate initiation for therapeutic purposes is valid also for certain forms of psychoanalysis. One should not come to regard them as the only means of relieving or of curing psychical sexual

troubles. The trite principle that sexual troubles of the unconscious, as all other inhibitions of identical origin, can be suppressed only by their being brought to the level of consciousness, is not valid if it is generalized without distinction. The indirect treatment also has its efficacy and often it suffices to a large extent. As to the use of the psychoanalytic method in the sexual domain, Our allocation of September 13, already cited, pointed out the moral limits. In truth, one cannot consider as licit, without further consideration, the evocation to the level of consciousness of all the representations, emotions and sexual experiences which lie dormant in the memory and the unconscious, and which are thus actualized in the psychic. If the protests arising from a sense of human and Christian dignity are heeded, who would risk making the claim that this manner of treatment does not imply both immediate and future moral danger, when, even if the therapeutic necessity of unlimited exploration be affirmed, this necessity is not, after all, established?

B. ERROR BY EXCESS

This consists in emphasizing the exigency of a total surrender of the ego and of its personal affirmation. With regard to this, We wish to consider two points: a general principle and a point of therapeutic practice.

From certain psychological explanations, the thesis is formulated that the unconditional extroversion of the ego constitutes the fundamental law of congenital altruism and of its dynamic tendencies. This is a logical, psychological and ethical error. There exists in fact a defense, an esteem, a love and a service of one's personal self which is not only justified but demanded by psychology and morality. It is a natural evidence and a lesson of the Christian Faith (Cf. *St. Thomas*, Sum. Th., 2a, 2ae p., q. 26, article 4, in c). Our Lord taught: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (*Mark*, 12, 31). Christ, then, proposes as the rule of love of neighbor charity towards oneself, not the contrary. Applied psychology would undervalue this reality if it were to describe all consideration of the ego as psychic inhibition, error, return to a state of former development, under the pretext that it is contrary to the natural altruism of the psychic being.

The point about psychotherapeutic practice that We mentioned concerns an essential interest of society: the safeguarding of secrets which the use of psychoanalysis endangers. It is not at all excluded that a fact or knowledge which is secret and repressed in the subconscious provokes serious psychic conflicts. If psychoanalysis discloses the cause of this trouble, it will want, according to its principle, to draw out entirely this unconscious element and make it conscious in order to remove the obstacle. But there are secrets which must on no account be divulged, even to a doctor, even in spite of grave personal inconveniences. The secret of Confession may never be revealed. It is equally forbidden for the professional secret to be communicated to another, including a doctor. The same is true of other secrets. One may invoke the principle: "for a proportionately grave reason it is permitted to reveal a secret to a prudent man and one capable of keeping a secret." This principle is correct within narrow limits for certain

kinds of secrets. It is not right to make use of it indiscriminately in psychoanalytic practice.

As regards morality, for the common good in the first place, the principle of discretion in the use of psychoanalysis cannot be sufficiently emphasized. Obviously it not primarily a question of the discretion of the psychoanalyst, but of that of the patient, who frequently has no right whatever to give away his secrets.

IV. MAN AS A TRANSCENDENT UNIT

This last aspect of man brings up three questions which We would not wish to overlook.

First of all, scientific research is drawing attention to a dynamism which, rooted in the depths of the psychic being, would push man towards the infinite which is beyond him, not by making him know it, but through an ascending gravitation issuing directly from the ontological substratum. This dynamism is regarded as an independent force, the most fundamental and the most elementary of the soul, an affective impulse carrying man immediately to the Divine, just as a flower opens up to light and sunshine without knowing it, or as a child breathes unconsciously as soon as it is born.

This assertion immediately calls forth an observation. If it is stated that this dynamism is at the origin of all religions, that it manifests the element common to all, We know on the contrary that religions, the natural and supernatural knowledge of God and worship of Him, do not proceed from the unconscious or the subconscious, nor from an impulse of the affections, but from the clear and certain knowledge of God by means of His natural and positive revelation. This is the doctrine and the belief of the Church, beginning with the word of God in the *Book of Wisdom* and the *Epistle to the Romans*, down to the Encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* [on modernism] of Our Predecessor, Blessed Pius X.

Having laid down this principle, there still remains the question of this mysterious dynamism. On this subject one might make the following remarks. We should certainly not find fault with depth psychology if it deals with the psychic aspect of religious phenomena and endeavors to analyze and reduce it to a scientific system, even if this research is new and if its terminology is not found in the past. We mention this point, because misunderstandings can easily arise when psychology attributes new meanings to already accepted expressions. Prudence and reserve are needed on both sides in order to avoid false interpretations and to make it possible to reach a reciprocal understanding.

It pertains to the technique of your science to clarify the questions of the existence, the structure and the mode of action of this dynamism. If its outcome proves to be positive, it should not be declared irreconcilable with reason or faith. This would only show that, even in its deepest roots, *esse ab alio* [to be from another], also implies an *esse ad alium* [to be for another], and that St. Augustine's words: "Thou hast made us for thyself, O Lord, and our heart shall not rest until it rests in thee" (*Confessions*,

Book 1, chapter 1, N.1), find a new confirmation in the very depths of man's psychic being. Even if there were question of a dynamism involving all men, peoples, epochs and cultures, what a help and what an invaluable help this would be for the search after God and the affirmation of His existence!

To the transcendent relations of the psychic being there belongs also the sense of guilt, the consciousness of having violated a higher law, by which, nevertheless, one recognizes oneself as being bound, a consciousness which can find expression in suffering and in psychic disorder.

Psychotherapy here approaches a phenomenon which is not within its own exclusive field of competence, for this phenomenon is also, if not principally, of a religious nature. No one will deny that there can exist—and not infrequently—an irrational and even morbid sense of guilt. But a person may also be aware of a real fault which has not been wiped away.

Neither psychology nor ethics possesses an infallible criterion for cases of this kind, since the workings of conscience which beget this sense of guilt have too personal and subtle a structure. But in any case, it is certain that no purely psychological treatment will cure a genuine sense of guilt. Even if psychotherapists, perhaps even in good faith, question its existence, it still perdures. Even if the sense of guilt be eliminated by medical intervention, autosuggestion or outside persuasion, the fault remains, and psychotherapy would both deceive itself and deceive others if, in order to do away with the sense of guilt, it pretended that the fault no longer exists.

The means of eliminating the fault does not belong to the purely psychological order. As every Christian knows, it consists in contrition and sacramental absolution by the priest. Here, it is the root of the evil, it is the fault itself, which is extirpated, even though remorse may continue to make itself felt. Nowadays, in certain pathological cases, it is not rare for the priest to send his penitent to a doctor. In the present case, the doctor should rather direct his patient towards God and to those who have the power to remit the fault itself in the name of God.

A final remark on the transcendent orientation of the psychic being towards God. Respect for God and His holiness must always be reflected in man's conscious acts. When, even without subjective fault on the part of the person involved, these acts are in contrast to the divine model, they still run counter to the ultimate finality of his being. That is why what is called "material sin" is something which should not exist, and which constitutes in the moral order a reality which is not indifferent.

From this a conclusion follows for psychotherapy. In the presence of material sin it cannot remain neutral. It can, for the moment, tolerate what remains inevitable. But it must know that God cannot justify such an action. With still less reason can psychotherapy counsel a patient to commit material sin on the ground that it will be without subjective guilt. Such a counsel would also be erroneous if this action were regarded as necessary for the psychic easing of the patient and thus as being part of the treatment. One may never counsel a conscious action which would be a deformation, and not an image, of the divine perfection.

That is what We feel obliged to say to you. In addition, be assured that the Church follows your research and your medical practice with her warm interest and her best wishes. You labor on a terrain that is very difficult. But your activity is capable of achieving precious results for medicine, for the knowledge of the soul in general, for the religious dispositions of man and for their development.

May Providence and divine grace enlighten your path! In pledge thereof We impart to you with paternal benevolence Our Apostolic Benediction.



Religious Ignorance

To a large number of non-Catholics, the Catholic Church is a mystery which they fear to explore, lest they should come under the spell of the power of Rome. This is not extraordinary, despite the supposed enlightenment of our day and age. Secular education, shying away from religion as a "controversial" subject, equips its students quite satisfactorily in many fields but dispels none of their ignorance of religion. Religious education, except in a limited sphere, is a primary concern only of the Catholic Church in the United States. This is a bald, but patent, fact. I have been amazed, as no doubt many priests have been, to find an almost complete ignorance of religious truth among otherwise cultured and well educated non-Catholics. The fact of the matter is that, for all their wisdom and knowledge in science, literature, music, art, politics and sociology, the field of religion is, for a host of our non-Catholic neighbors, a virgin soil.—*Jerome P. Holland in TECHNIQUES FOR CONVERT-MAKERS, New York, N. Y., November, 1949.*

Love without Bounds

Today we live in a world wherein distances have been dramatically shortened, a fact which creates new problems but also offers new opportunities.

Living, as we do, face to face, we have to try to understand one another in a way that in previous ages was not so necessary. But if we succeed in understanding one another, the opportunity of harmony and unity and charity will be so much the greater.

This fact alone offers a special challenge to Catholics, whose faith bids them realize as much as possible the spiritual bond of love, which is the inner motive power and strength of their faith, as it is the means of the strengthening and spreading of the "good news" which alone can bring harmony and peace among men.—*CATHOLIC HERALD, London, England, Feb. 20, 1953.*

Function of the University

POPE PIUS XII

A letter of His Holiness to the 22nd World Congress of Pax Romana, Montreal, Canada, dated August 12, 1952. This translation was furnished by RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE.

WHAT a motive of joy and hope for Our paternal heart is your world assembly of Catholic students and intellectuals being held in the land of Canada, which is so dear to Us, and especially in the Province of Quebec, which is preparing to celebrate the centenary of its first university.

One cannot but see therein a pledge of a new impulse for Christian culture in North America and of a wider radiation of your twofold international movement.

We are glad, moreover, that many cities situated in the two linguistic regions of your country have been associated with your labors, and We have no doubts regarding the warm reception of the religious, civil and university authorities.

We would have you know, too, when the 22nd Congress of *Pax Romana* opens under the presidency of Our venerable brother, the Archbishop of Montreal, that We Ourselves are present in spirit in your midst, invoking upon your sessions an abundant outpouring of Divine graces.

From the Congress of Amsterdam to that of Montreal, the same apostolic ideal inspires your labors. For this reason We wish, first of all, to confirm as ever actual the directives We addressed to you lately on the role of intellectuals in the Church.

Furthermore, the theme of the present Congress, "The Mission of the University," prompts Us to define today those directives regarding a point that is particularly dear to Us, in remembrance of the decisive action of the Roman Pontiffs in the origin of the first universities and in the course of their brilliant history.

If the vicissitudes of the times have sometimes relaxed the age-old links between the Church and universities, the present-day disorientation of a mankind eager for unity and concord, and the spiritual anguish of so many persons of good will, all invite you to re-establish those links once again.

It is with that thought that you, Catholic students and intellectuals, shall apply yourselves to the study of the mission—traditional, yet ever new—of the university; your duty is to know it well in order to serve it well.

In the first place, anybody who considers the university as a community of teachers and students dedicated to works of the spirit cannot deny that its mission is to be a center radiating intellectual life for the benefit of the national community, in that atmosphere of healthy freedom that is proper to all culture. This is a permanent task in which Our children have never ceased to collaborate.

However, if the university wishes to render fruitful for the new genera-

tions the centuries-old treasures which it has received in deposit, then it must bear in mind particular contemporary conditions.

For is this not a time, in effect, when in many countries large sectors of the population aspire to a participation in an authentic culture, when the economic and social difficulties of student and professional life pose grave problems for those in authority, and when, finally, modern means of information are incessantly increasing their influence, sometimes to the detriment of the real education of personal thought?

If we broaden our perspective, we notice that an analogous task confronts the great family of the universities, heir of mankind's cultural patrimony. In order to maintain themselves free of harmful particularizations, it is necessary to multiply the contacts between teachers and students of the various countries, to develop, by the study of languages and by useful collaboration, the appreciation of the intellectual riches proper to each; it is thus that people, far from becoming involved in competition and opposition to one another, will rather delight in supplying their reciprocal deficiencies.

Here We cannot but express Our felicitations to the *Pax Romana* movement for its patient efforts directed to this end, and We are likewise appreciative of the development of methodical action on an international plane, in the service of science and culture.

UNITY OF TRUTH

But this mission of the university, which brings together men and peoples in a peaceful intellectual collaboration, would be deceptive if it were not realized in a progressive co-ordination of the knowledge which they possess. Could the communion of minds be usefully achieved outside the unity of truth?

A university, as We observed a short time ago, does not mean merely the juxtaposition of abilities which are foreign to one another, but the synthesis of all the objects of knowledge. . . . And modern progress, with its specializations always more refined, renders this synthesis more necessary than ever before. (Discourse to the Catholic Institute of Paris, Sept. 21, 1950).

In truth, modern progress renders such a synthesis more difficult and fragile as well, and the university must protect it from two contrasting dangers. The first would be the undue interference of the state, which, going beyond its powers, would presume to impose on education, for political or ideological ends, the specious unity of an arbitrary philosophy.

But, on the other hand, the university would fulfill its mission badly were it to abandon itself to pluralism or to a superficial syncretism; on the mere plane of natural knowledge, its task is to overcome the difference of subjects, to promote wisdom and to form the intellectual personality of the student. Let it be on its guard, therefore, lest it fail in its highest mission, namely, that of giving to young minds a respect for truth, and of guiding them to independent lines of thought, indispensable to their intellectual maturity.

A delicate mission, full of firmness and discretion, to which We especially invite our Catholic universities, illumined in their task by the splendors of the Faith; they alone can pursue the effort for synthesis to the keystone of the edifice itself, for this unity will tend towards its perfection only in the measure in which it seeks itself in God, in charity illumined by science, according to the single truth of the Gospel, under the guidance of the Church, one and holy. (Discourse to the International Committee for the Unity and the Universality of Culture, Nov. 14, 1951). At the service of the young student, such universities, crowned by the teaching of Christian philosophy and theology, will be schools of truth; they will also be mistresses of life, Christian, moral, civic and social.

May this world congress be then, for the members of *Pax Romana*, the occasion for arousing a more vivid consciousness of the responsibilities common to a grave hour of history; may it be for every sector of the universities the starting point for a more fraternal collaboration and for more enriching exchanges, allowing the university to better fulfill in the world its eminently humane and pacific mission, to which the Church attaches such great worth.

We give expression to this wish with all Our heart, and in pledge of these sentiments We impart to you and to all the students and intellectuals of your two movements Our most paternal Apostolic Benediction.

Segregation in Church Life

Public laws, customs of long standing, regulations and agreements of institutions and between business interests are obstacles not easy to overcome, but we can do much to aid this cause of justice and charity by making segregation disappear in our Catholic church life. We have already made notable progress by the removal of offensive signs that limited the use of certain pews, and by the aggregation of colored units with the Metropolitan, Deanery and Diocesan Unions of the Holy Name Society, the Sodality and Councils of Catholic Men and Women.

Ever mindful, therefore, of the basic truth that our colored Catholic brethren share with us the same spiritual life and destiny, the same membership in the Mystical Body of Christ, the same dependence upon the Word of God, the participation in the sacraments, especially the Most Holy Eucharist, the same need of moral and social encouragement, let there be no further discrimination or segregation in the pews, at the Communion rail, at the confessional and in the parish meetings, just as there will be no segregation in the kingdom of heaven.—*Most Rev. Joseph F. Rummel, Archbishop of New Orleans, Pastoral Letter, March 15, 1953.*

Soviet Terror in Poland

*Memorandum of the Polish National Democratic Committee to the United Nations,
April 7, 1953.*

THE representatives of the Russian puppet government of Poland and Czechoslovakia have introduced, on March 23 and 24, in the Political and Security Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations charges of "Interference by the United States in the internal affairs of other states." The representative of the United States, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., promptly answered stating: "If the Kremlin leaders are really looking for the people who are subverting life behind the Iron Curtain, they should look at themselves—at their laws, their decrees, their practices of oppression. They should look at the Lenin-Stalinist doctrines on which they have impaled nearly half the world."

The Polish National Democratic Committee takes up the challenge so hastily tossed to the international forum by the Kremlin stooges and takes this opportunity to present briefly the most striking facts showing the practices of oppression indulged in by the Government of the Soviet Union and their puppet government in Warsaw with regard to the Polish nation.

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has, since 1939, both directly and through the forcefully imposed Communist puppet government in Warsaw, exercised steady pressure against the Polish nation and has thereby encroached upon its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The interference of

the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of Poland presents a clear case of aggression which combines a steady pressure from the outside with subversive activity within the country. All basic principles and commitments of the United Nations, as expressed in the Charter of the United Nations, are being completely violated by the Soviet Union in its relations with Poland.

1. We accuse the Soviet Union of being responsible for causing the Second World War by concluding the Stalin-Hitler pact in 1939.

2. We accuse the Soviet Union of an act of armed aggression against Poland on the 17th of September, 1939, from the east, at the time of the invasion of Poland by Hitler from the west, and of annexing part of the Polish Republic in virtue of the secret clause of the so-called Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of August 23, 1939.

Having invaded the eastern territories of Poland the Soviet authorities disarmed and imprisoned in Russia a substantial part of the Polish Army. At the same time they resorted to the mass deportation of the Polish civilian population to Russia with the result that, in the years 1939 and 1940, over one and a half million of Polish citizens were abducted and the majority of them perished in Soviet forced-labor camps.

3. We accuse the Soviet Union of causing the death of hundreds of thousands of Poles as well as of the ignominious mass murder, in 1940 in Soviet

Russia, of some 15,000 officers of the Polish Army and experts of various professional fields—prisoners of war—who were put to death at Katyn by the infamous NKVD, as has been many times proved.

SUBJECTION OF THE PEOPLE

4. The subjection of the Polish people to the Communist system was planned carefully and prepared in advance. A group of Soviet citizens, among them Mrs. Wanda Wasilewska-Kornejczuk, a member of the Supreme Soviet, Stefan Jedrychowski, a member of the Supreme Soviet, and Alexander Zawadzki, a colonel of NKVD, was first organized in Moscow into the so-called Society of Polish Patriots, later transformed into the so-called Lublin Committee, which was imposed on Poland as the "Polish Government" in the year 1944. Further, in order to assure the command of the military units formed in Russia by the said Society of Polish Patriots, 11,000 Soviet generals and officers, dressed in Polish uniforms, were assigned to the Polish Army and took commands in Poland under the leadership of General Karczyc, who was appointed chief of staff of the Polish Army.

5. As the Red Army advanced to the west and entered Polish territory, the wave of terrorism and arrests of the members of the Polish underground, who fought against the Nazi aggressors during the five years of the German occupation of the country, began to rage.

The most flagrant case of perfidy and deceit was the arrest in March, 1945, of the Vice Premier of the Polish Government, of three Ministers, of the former Commander of the Home Army, who had so bravely opposed and fought

throughout the war the Hitler forces, and of eleven political leaders, members of the underground parliament of Poland. All of them were lured into the headquarters of the Soviet Army commander, General Ivanov, in the suburbs of Warsaw on the pretext of negotiations having in view execution of the disposition of the Yalta Agreement. Once having entered the premises of the Russian general they disappeared—were arrested and forcibly taken to Moscow, where they were imprisoned. The fact of their arrest was concealed from the world and was first disclosed only two months later by Molotov at the San Francisco Conference on May 4, 1945. In June 1945, they were tried for "treason" by a military court in Moscow and sentenced to long terms in prison, where some of them are still kept to the present day.

6. We accuse the Soviet Union of aiding the Germans in the well-nigh complete destruction of the Polish capital—Warsaw.

Broadcasting through the Soviet radio station "Kosciuszko," the Soviets called on the people of Warsaw, in July, 1944, as the Red Army was nearing the city, to rise against the Germans. The Soviet armies under the command of Marshal Rokossowski were then only two miles from the Praga district of Warsaw situated on the right bank of the Vistula River. The left and right wings of his army were advanced even farther to the west. However, when the rising of Warsaw broke out on August 1, 1944, Rokossowski stopped the advance of his army and the attacks on Warsaw, although then the Polish Home Army fighting in Warsaw kept firmly in hand that most important bridgehead and the bridges on the Vistula intact. No greater strategic advantage could have been offered

to an army pursuing an offensive attack. And yet Rokossowski and his army watched passively the Warsaw fighters bleeding unaided on the other side of the river.

Upon personal appeal on the part of Mr. Mikolajczyk, then Premier of the Polish Government in exile in London, Stalin at first promised some aid to the Warsaw uprising. However, he never kept his promise and, what is more, he refused to cooperate with the Allies in giving any help. President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, willing to send by air to Warsaw the necessary supplies of arms, ammunition and medicines, asked the Russians for the right of landing behind the Russian front-line. That demand was rejected, Stalin threatening even to shoot down Allied planes if they attempted to bring help to Warsaw and land behind the Soviet front. In this way the aid to Warsaw by the Allies was made an impossible task. With Rokossowski's army were the Poles organized by Russia in the so-called Berling troops, who naturally were anxious to go to the aid of Warsaw, but Rokossowski withdrew them from the front.

There can be no doubt that the Soviets wanted the destruction of Warsaw—the center of Polish political, cultural, military and social life.

The Soviets willingly and purposely aided the Nazis to reduce Warsaw to ashes. Warsaw, the citadel of patriotism, the brain and heart of Polish independence, after sixty-three days of single-handed fight, was doomed to destruction by the Communist planners in order to subject the Polish nation to their regime and designs.

7. The officers and soldiers of the Home Army, who had proved themselves to be hard fighters against the Nazi occupation and helped consid-

erably the advancing Red Army, were also singled out by the Soviets for extinction. Wherever the so-called Red Army of Liberation set foot, the former members of the Polish Home Army were arrested and deported to Russia. Many thousands of them perished in Soviet forced-labor camps and many of them are still kept there.

FORCIBLE APPROPRIATION OF POLISH TERRITORY

8. We accuse the Soviet Union of forcible appropriation of part of Poland's territory and of the subjugation by Soviet Russia of the whole of Poland. On July 25, 1944, an agreement surrendering forty-eight per cent of the territory of the Polish Republic to Soviet Russia had been signed. The Lublin Committee had given to Russia in the same agreement the right to arrest and deport from Poland Polish citizens. On April 21, 1945, Stalin signed with Soviet citizen Boleslaw Bierut, posing as the president of a National Council of Poland, a treaty of friendship, mutual assistance and post-war cooperation between Poland and the Soviet Union. Stalin made these agreements with his agents, who had never received any mandates from the Polish people, who were not acting for the Polish people and had no authority to enter into any kind of agreements. These agreements were signed by them after the severance of diplomatic relations by the Soviet Union with the Polish Government in London, before any elections were held in Poland. The first agreement was signed at the time when the greater part of Poland was still under the German occupation. These were agreements signed by the Communist partners preparing for the enslavement of the Polish people in the interest of the Soviet imperialism

and therefore cannot be and are not binding on the Polish nation, who do not recognize them or any other decision based on these agreements.

PEOPLE PLUNDERED

9. We accuse the Soviet Union and the Red Army of the mass-plunder of the Polish people in 1944 and 1945.

Poland was already a devastated country after the German Army passed through it from west to east in 1939, and the year 1944-45 brought again the war juggernaut moving in the opposite direction. This time it was the so-called army of liberators, who, however, conducted themselves in a manner worse than that of a cruel conqueror. Hundreds of towns and villages were set on fire or destroyed a day or two after the fighting front had left them behind. This implemented a premeditated plan. Although pretending to be liberators, the Red Army claimed and took war booty everywhere. Factories were dismantled, machinery, equipment, stocks of raw material, food and livestock were taken and shipped to Russia. Hundreds of trains, loaded with furniture and household equipment, steamed eastward.

The agents of Stalin confiscated all the financial resources of the population in Poland by ordering people to deposit in the banks all their cash. The maximum sum of 500 zloties—about \$7—was paid in exchange in a new Polish currency printed in Moscow and brought to Poland. No compensation was given for the amounts deposited exceeding 500 zloties.

The amount of the new currency issued was estimated by the end of 1945 at 7 billion zloties, of which only 3 billion were put in circulation by the so-called Polish treasury, the rest being used directly by the Red Army for

payments to the population for the purchase of supplies. The Polish treasury was debited, however, for the full amount of 7 billion.

Further exploitation of the Polish nation by the Red Army was performed by the maintenance of 300,000 Soviet troops on the western territories of Poland, under the command of Marshal Rokossowski, with headquarters at Legnica. This army lived in 1945-46 on the land estates, an agricultural and industrial establishment consisting of over 5 million hectares. On returning these estates, the Soviet troops, as a rule, took with them all agricultural products, livestock, equipment and machinery. Millions of Poles transferred from Eastern Poland, when settled on these lands, were put, therefore, to the greatest of hardships before being able to reconstruct them to the productive level. Such devastation and exploitation had the Polish people suffered at the hands of the Soviet authorities at the time when the UNRRA brought to Poland aid in the form of food, machinery and factory equipment to the value of half a billion dollars.

In August, 1945, Molotov imposed on Poland a coal agreement requiring from the nation the delivery to Soviet Russia of 12 million tons of coal per year at the price of \$1.25 per ton. This resulted in a net loss for the Polish people of \$100 million yearly.

Such were the practices of the Soviet usurpers of power in Poland when they came under the guise of liberators. As the result of the system of economy subsequently introduced and directed from Moscow, and interference of the Soviet Union, Poland has already been integrated into the Soviet economy and serves primarily to increase the military potential of the Soviet Union.

10. We accuse the Soviet Union of systematic police terror being applied by their agents on the Polish people.

From the very first days of the occupation of Poland by the Soviet troops, in 1944, a security police was formed, headed, commanded and trained by Soviet officers of all grades. Although dressed in Polish uniforms, they are a Russian force. They entered Poland about 100,000 strong. At once a period of police terror, arrests and mass murder of political opponents started. The courts martial composed of Soviet officers as judges were introduced.

This force was under the orders of a Russian citizen, Colonel of NKVD Radkiewicz, who was appointed Minister of Public Security, a post he still holds today. Every country security office has even at present as adviser an officer in Soviet uniform, so that the true masters of this system of terrorism are not even disguised. To help the security police in discharging their duties, detachments of military police troops were formed under the name of the Corps of Internal Security. The Soviet General Kiniewicz was appointed its commander.

NO FREE ELECTIONS

11. We accuse the Soviet Union of preventing, through their puppet regime, the people from expressing their will in free elections, and thus of breaking the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In June, 1946, there was held a so-called public referendum in which the population was to answer three generally favored questions: 1) Approval of the western frontier of Poland; 2) introduction of social reforms; 3)

abolition of the second chamber—the Senate—in the Parliament. Positive answers were to be expected and in this way the government in Warsaw aimed to obtain indirect endorsement of the population in the public vote. The regime coined the slogan: all should answer three times "Yes." In order to test the public sentiment and to challenge the regime's bid for popular endorsement, the parties of the opposition entered the campaign with the admonition: we shall answer the first and second questions "yes" and the third "no." Despite the terror by the Soviet officers stationed in Poland and officially engaged in the conduct of the referendum under the command of Russian General Korczyc, despite the terror of the security police commanded by the Russian officers Radkiewicz and Kiniewicz, the overwhelming majority of the Polish people declared themselves against the Communists and voted twice "yes" and once "no." Although the published results of the referendum were in most cases falsified, the majority of negatives was so overwhelming that the regime could not deny its defeat.

This was responsible for the outbreak of new political terror in the country. To divert the attention of public opinion of the West, a military squad commanded by a Soviet officer staged at that time a pogrom on Jews at Kielce and attempted to shift the responsibility for it to the innocent Polish population. The arguments and the provocation were, however, staged in such a crude manner that the truth could not be hidden.

After long delay, the first elections in Poland to be held under the Communist regime were ordered for the 19th of January, 1947.

On September 28, 1946, Stalin called

a conference in Moscow of representatives of the Polish Communists and pseudo-Socialists. This conference fixed in advance the distribution of mandates, ordered to break down and terrorize the Polish nation in order to force it to vote for the single list of candidates of the Communist bloc. The order was to use the army, under the command of the Soviet General Korczyc, Chief of Staff in Warsaw, for the electoral campaign.

In the preelectoral terror there were engaged not only the army but also the police, composed of Soviet officers and soldiers. Threats of deportation to Siberia of the resisting people were a widely used argument. Two memoranda depicting the terrible terror, the arrests of some 100,000 people by the police, the beatings and even assassination of innocent citizens by the police were presented in December, 1946 and January, 1947 to the Ambassadors of the United States, Great Britain and Soviet Russia, on behalf of the Polish Peasant Party, which openly opposed the Communists.

Despite this terror the great majority of the Polish people voted against the Communists, casting their votes for the only opposition ticket, the Polish Peasant Party, which was allowed in the field. The result was that 84 per cent of the votes cast went to the opposition. This figure is known because the puppet government had to report to Stalin, upon his own request, the real facts connected with the election. Stalin wanted to be advised what degree of influence his agents commanded in Poland. Officially, however, the regime proclaimed an 85-per-cent victory for the Communist bloc. The will expressed in the elections by the people was thus overridden. The terror and the will of the Kremlin agents prevailed. The

road for intensified communization and sovietization of Poland was paved.

12. We accuse the Soviet Union of depriving the Polish people of sovereign rights, by forcing on them the Soviet forms of government and subjecting them to the reign of political, economic, cultural and religious oppression.

After falsifying the results of the elections, in compliance with Stalin's orders, the puppet regime in Warsaw intensified the sovietization of Poland.

In the political sphere, in 1947, the so-called "Small Constitution" was enacted, introducing formally in Poland the Russian system of soviets.

In the economic sphere laws were passed aiming at the complete destruction of private property, private initiative and private trade.

Special commissions were instituted which, without any regard to justice or equity, systematically confiscated small trade and industrial enterprises.

Special Soviet advisers were sent to Poland to plan the new economy, adjusted to the needs of the general Soviet economic system and plans, disregarding the requirements of the Polish national economy. The sovietization of Polish economic life and the economic integration of Poland with the Soviet Union had begun.

In 1948, the Soviet-style collectivization of agriculture was officially imposed on Poland. The Stakhanovite system of production and discipline of labor, with the forced-labor camps for the resisting people, were introduced. Freedom of movement and choice of work were either suppressed or greatly restricted. By installing the state-sponsored system of monopolistic trade unions, which are in reality instruments for the application of pressure by the

state upon the workers, a system of modern slavery was instituted.

In December, 1951, a law was proclaimed introducing a new educational system fully adjusted to the indoctrination requirements of the Soviet system. The system changes universities into institutions for the training of new cadres of young intelligentsia in the spirit of Marxism and for spreading the Communist outlook.

Freedom of thought and opinion do not exist, and the slightest criticism of Communism, Soviet Russia, or the other Communist governments, is considered to be a major crime.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

Religion, and especially the Catholic Church, are severely persecuted, the clergy being terrorized. The church in Poland has been under attack for a long time, but in view of the special esteem of the Church in public opinion, the attacks on it were oblique. Recently a direct blow against the Church was struck. Five bishops and several hundreds of priests have been put in prison. Many of the priests received death sentences. A decree was issued on the 10th of February, 1953, by which all appointments to ecclesiastic offices and transfers of priests and bishops are subject to the previous consent of the state administration, which also claims the right to remove the bishops and the priests from their posts. The proclamation of this decree aims to break forcibly the contacts of the Polish ecclesiastical hierarchy with Rome. It constitutes a direct attack against the unity and very existence of the Catholic Church in Poland.

The same policy of religious intolerance and violence is pursued in relation to other faiths.

The authority of the Orthodox

Church, guaranteeing its independence, was abolished and the church was subordinated to Moscow.

The bishop of the National Catholic Church, Padewski, an American citizen, who had come to Poland, died in the prison of the security police in Warsaw.

Freedom of the press and of information do not exist. Instead, a government monopoly of information is established, and through this means the population is indoctrinated in Soviet beliefs and hatred of everything that comes from the West, and is subjected to extreme pressure of russification.

In 1949, the Soviet Marshal Rokossovski was imposed on Poland as Commander in Chief of the Polish Armed Forces and as Marshal of Poland. In the disguise of Minister of National Defense, he transferred his Soviet staff from Legnica to Warsaw. In Warsaw he performs the functions of the Kremlin's military commander, responsible for Soviet strategy on the sector of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Eastern Germany and the Baltic region. At the same time he was assigned the control of the Central Committee of the Polish Communist Party, known as the Polish United Workers' Party, becoming a member of that committee.

FINANCIAL REFORM

In 1950, another financial reform took place and new currency was introduced. The dollar was abandoned as basic unit of exchange in foreign commercial agreements and the ruble replaced it. As an especially favorable rate of exchange was fixed for the ruble, it has created a new source for the Soviet Union to increase the exploitation and advance the economic integration of Poland. The change of the currency also served the purpose of

depriving the people of their savings (the rate of convertibility of savings was 10 times smaller than the rate of convertibility of wages), and of making them still more dependent on the Communist regime.

In July, 1952, a new Soviet-style constitution was imposed on Poland. The name of the Polish State was changed from Republic of Poland to Polish People's Republic so as to make it similar to the names of the republics of the Soviet Union.

Immediately after the Moscow Congress of October, 1952, Soviet-style elections were held in Poland and several Soviet generals and citizens were elected to the Polish Parliament from strategically important electoral districts, which in the future will decide about the official incorporation of Poland into the framework of the Soviet Union.

Here are the names of these Soviet generals: Konstanty Rokossowski, Stanisław Radkiewicz, Zdzisław Studzinski, Jan Rotkiewicz, Władysław Korczyc, Bronisław Polturzycki, Włodzimierz Struzewski, Stanisław Poplawski, Jerzy Bordziłowski, Bolesław Kiniewicz, Aleksander Zawadzki.

The role of the Soviet generals in the public life of Poland is steadily growing. Just recently another Russian general, Bronisław Polturzycki, was appointed vice chairman of the State Commission of Economic Planning.

In order to follow further the pattern of Soviet economic organization, on January 4, 1953, a new system of wages and prices was introduced and for the third time the Polish people were robbed by the state through devaluation of the currency.

Masking their constant intervention

in the internal affairs of the Polish nation, whom they deprived of freedom and independence with the help of their agents, the Soviets are striving to achieve their final goal, which is the official incorporation of Poland into the Soviet Union. Therefore, Moscow and its agents have launched an especially violent propaganda campaign against the West and in particular against the United States, accusing it of interference in the internal affairs of Poland.

APPEAL TO UN

We consider it as a disgrace to the Polish nation that the puppet government in Warsaw and its representatives abroad, whom we accuse, and have exposed as guilty, of most serious crimes perpetrated upon the Polish nation, are allowed to speak on the international forum in the name of the people whom they oppress. It is regrettable that the flagrant violators of the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are not brought to account by the very organization created to uphold and safeguard the principles established in its charter. The voice of the free representatives of the now silenced Polish nation should be heard and should be afforded more opportunity to be heard.

Accusing the Soviet Union and its agents in Poland of depriving the Polish people of their independence and of exercising a rule of terror and violence toward them, we declare at the same time our readiness to present more detailed proofs and express the earnest hope that the case of Poland will be placed on the agenda of the United Nations.

The Bricker Resolution

Statement of the Subcommittee on Juridical Institutions of the Catholic Association for International Peace. Reprinted from the CAIP NEWS, April, 1953.

CERTAIN amendments to the United States Constitution proposed by Senator Bricker (S.J.R. 1) seek to limit the treaty-making power vested in the President and Senate and to limit the executive-agreement power of the President. The fundamental moral principle involved is that of public faith necessary to the conduct of all national and international relations. The proposed amendments would seriously undermine public faith in actions of the United States Government. Nothing is more necessary to the achievement of peaceful, fruitful relations among men and nations than good faith. Good faith among civilized nations means that pledges given or received can be trusted.

The stated purposes of such amendments are primarily 1) to prevent the powers delegated by the United States Constitution to the Federal Government from being curtailed by or transferred to any international or supra-national authority, 2) to prevent the powers reserved by that Constitution to the States from being similarly abrogated or modified and 3) to prevent "the fundamental civil or political rights of citizens of the United States" from being similarly affected.

The Juridical Institutions Subcommittee feels that these limitations would make U.S. participation in any program of enforceable disarmament through international control of atomic weapons and other forms of atomic energy virtually impossible, in as much as any such program would of necessity call for some form of international supervision of all atomic energy and would therefore be prohibited by the terms of Section 2 of the Bricker resolution.

We maintain not only that such amendments would seriously handicap the future development of the United States, but that they would prevent or hamper the development and codification of international law. If they had been in force earlier they would probably have made impossible the approval or ratification of many necessary and useful treaties or conventions already adopted.

Not only would they actually impair the sovereignty of the United States in its nation-to-nation dealings; they would imply acceptance of the false assumption that an individual state has no obligation to world society. Moral law requires that states establish and accept such international law as is necessary for the achievement of the international common good. Progress in the formulation of international law has been made primarily through international treaty. If even the present treaty bases for international law are so attacked and crippled, no sound structure of international law and order can be developed.

Furthermore, such amendments would handicap the United States at a time when speedy action in the field of cooperative military action may be necessary to guarantee its safety and that of the free world in the face of threatened Communist aggression.

Section 2 of the Bricker resolution is so loosely and vaguely worded that it is bound to cause conflicting and confusing interpretations which might alter our traditional Constitutional system. Sections 3, 4 and 5, with reference to the subjection of U.S. foreign relations (including executive or other agreements) to "appropriate legislation," would bring control of the Executive's function completely under Congress and would immediately make foreign policy a matter of partisan politics. It would, for instance, permit Congress to pass further restrictive legislation allowing executive agreements to expire at the end of every Executive's term.

There is no present threat to the Constitutional liberties of U.S. citizens which renders the amendments necessary or desirable. The President and the Senate, which now ratifies all treaties by a two-thirds vote, can be relied upon to see that the treaty powers are prudently and wisely exercised, and to protect the freedom and interests of U.S. citizens in the future as in the past.

However praiseworthy may be the motives of the proponents and however important may be the principles they seek to re-assert, nevertheless the adoption of any such amendments would prejudice the domestic security and foreign relations of the United States.

This Subcommittee is therefore opposed to the adoption of the Bricker resolution because it would place unnecessary restrictions upon the United States Government. It urges furthermore that this attempt be repudiated in the interests of the United States and its citizens in a just world order based on the development of true international law and procedure and on the maintenance of public faith.



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Paul A. Reed

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.